MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

THIRD SESSION OF THE FIRST LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY UNDER THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1935.

Volume VII (Nos. 1 to 5).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGES

Monday, the 15th August 1938.

Personnel of the Government of Madras 1–25
I Swearing in of new Members 27
II Condolence resolution *re* death of Mr. B. Raja Rao 27–28
III Statement of Mr. Speaker on the cancellation of his tour to Europe 28–32
IV Questions and Answers 32–67, 85–101
V Supplementary statement of expenditure for the year 1938–39. 67
VI Panel of Chairmen 67
VII House Committee 68

Government Bills.

VIII The Indian Lunacy (Madras Amendment) Bill 68–69
IX The Madras Medical Registration (Amendment) Bill, 1938 .. 70–74
X The Madras Estates Land Act (Amendment) Bill, 1938 .. 74
XI The Prisons and Indian Lunacy (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1938 75

Government Resolution.

XII Resolution *re* debentures issued by the Madras Co-operative Central Land Mortgage Bank 75–82
XIII Papers laid on the table of the House 82–84, 102

Tuesday, the 16th August 1938.

I Questions and Answers 103–122, 146

Government Bills.

II The Madras Famine Relief Fund (Amendment) Bill, 1938 .. 122–124
III The Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1938 124–125
IV The Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1938 125–136
V The Madras Minor Ports Fund Bill, 1938 136–140
VI The Madras Borstal Schools (Amendment) Bill, 1938 140
VII The Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1938 140–145

Y211,31 'N38
N39.7;6

CONTENTS

PAGE

Wednesday, the 17th August 1938.

I Questions and Answers 147–160

Non-official Business.

II Bills—

(1) A Bill to provide for the removal of civil disabilities among certain classes of Hindus (L.A. Bill No. 9 of 1937) 160–167, 241–243

(2) The Madras Muslim Wakf Bill (Bill No. 6 of 1938) .. 167–182

(3) A Bill to remove the disabilities of the so-called depressed classes in regard to entry into Hindu temples (L.A. Bill No. 7 of 1938) 182–219

(4) A Bill further to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 219–226

(5) A Bill further to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, and the Madras City Municipal Act, 1919 226–228

(6) A Bill to repeal the Criminal Law Amendment Acts (XIV of 1908 and XXIII of 1932) in so far as they affect the Province of Madras 229–240

Thursday, the 18th August 1938.

I Questions and Answers 245–265, 349

II Messages from the Council 265–266

III House Committee 266

IV Election to the Annamalai University Senate 266–267

Non-official Business.

V Resolutions—

(1) The recent happenings in Burma 267–291

(2) Stoppage of the alleged repressive policy of the Government against anti-Hindi propagandists 291–348

Friday, the 19th August 1938.

I Questions and Answers 351–405, 410–415

II Demands for Grants for further expenditure for 1938–39 .. 405–408

(1) Grant X—District Administration and Miscellaneous .. 408

(2) Grant XXI—Industries 408

(3) Grant XXIII—Miscellaneous Departments 408

(4) Grant XXIV—Civil works—Works 408

(5) Grant XXV—Civil works—Establishment and tools and plant 408

(6) Grant XXXIII—Capital Outlay on Electric Schemes. 409

Government Motion.

III Motion regarding the strength of the Board of Commissioners for Hindu Religious Endowments 409

60748
MADRAS

18th August 1938] [Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar]

ment that must be feeling keenly for all this and our readiness to help and co-operate in every endeavour that may be made by that Government to give immediate relief as well as find permanent remedies for this state of affairs. The Government, Sir, accepts this resolution and promises to do all that is necessary to give effect to the resolution." (Applause.)

The resolution was put and carried.

(2) STOPPAGE OF THE ALLEGED REPRESSIVE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT AGAINST ANTI-HINDI PROPAGANDISTS.

MR. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" Sir, I move the resolution that stands in my name, namely:—

'*This Assembly recommends to the Government to stop its policy of repression against persons who take part in the anti-Hindi agitation.*'

" Sir, to consider this resolution, soon after the one that has just been passed with regard to the serious situation that is taking place in Burma, is certainly a fair trial. My object in giving notice of this resolution to be considered by this House is to suggest to the Government of Madras to stop the repressive policy that they have been adopting against those fellow countrymen of ours, who have been opposing the compulsory introduction of Hindi or Hindustani, whatever it is called, in the schools in this Presidency. Sir, the Government of Madras, it is true, included a certain amount of money for expenditure on this proposal, during this year, and the budget including that amount was passed by this very House. On that account, I understand that the Hon. the Premier believes that it is his duty as the Leader of the House—not only as the Leader of the House, but as the Premier of Madras—to give effect to the decision of this House. Sir, I might on this occasion, tell the Hon. Premier that what this House has done in this respect is not very different from what it did in giving a vote for a further sum to be made use of by the Hon. the Speaker for his tour in Europe. It is not absolutely necessary on that account for the Hon. the Premier to say that his hands are tied and that he is bound to give effect to the decision of this Legislature, in compulsorily introducing Hindi or Hindustani in some of the high schools in this Province. Sir, I would ask the Hon. the Premier, apart from his desire to introduce a common language in this Presidency which will be useful to the people at a later date in dealing with their fellow countrymen in other parts of the country, particularly in Northern India,—apart from that question, I would like to ask him most respectfully whether it is not his duty to consider the views expressed by a section of the people in this Presidency, however small it may be. I am sure he will not come forward and say

[Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan] [18th August 1938

that the people who are opposing the compulsory introduction of Hindustani into the schools are small in numbers and these people who are opposing the compulsory introduction of this language are not so much against this language, but that they are in opposition to the party itself. Sir, that may be the argument that may possibly be advanced by the Hon. the Premier in support of the stand that he has taken with regard to this thorny question. But the fact remains that the volume of opposition that
5-45 has gathered against the compulsory introduction of this lan-
p. m, guage has increased considerably. That fact cannot be denied. Not only in the City of Madras, but throughout the Presidency, and much more so, in the Tamil Nadu, opposition has become more voluminous, and it has been gaining ground.

(At this stage Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.)

"If any proof was wanting, there was sufficient proof given in the meetings that were held on the beach in recent times by those gentlemen who took the opposite view. Very largely attended meetings were held, and those meetings were carried on very peacefully, and for a long time. I did not attend any one of those meetings, but while I was passing along the Marina as late as 9 a.m. (laughter)—I am sorry, 9 p.m.—on the day, perhaps on which the first meeting was held, although it was raining heavily, I saw hundreds and thousands of people assembled at that meeting, and that meeting was going on peacefully. That shows that there is a considerable amount of feeling against this proposal, and that means that there are a large number of people who are opposed to Government's view. We have to take notice of that opposition. If we cannot take notice of that opposition it means that we are not concerned with public opinion. Public opinion expressed on the eve of election or at the time of election is not the only opinion that deserves consideration, but public opinion expressed at all times deserves the same consideration. That is, public opinion expressed at all times deserves the same consideration even as public opinion expressed either at the time of general election or by means of votes at bye-elections is considered valuable. Therefore at any time, when any public opinion is expressed with a certain amount of volume, it is the duty of Government, and much more so of that Government which regards itself as a national Government, to give heed to that opinion, which is expressed by a large number of people. You cannot brush aside the opinion that is expressed by a large number of people. For there must be something in that opinion; you have to consider, whether you should regard that opinion as useful or valuable and which should be given heed. Sir, it may be said, as I have already stated, that the agitation that is carried on against this proposal of the Government is carried on by the enemies of Government, by people who want to supplant this Government and take

18th August 1938] [Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

their place after this Government is defeated. That is certainly a matter which has to be investigated. Perhaps it may be true; even if it is true, is it not the duty of this Government which is responsible to those persons who have given votes to the party to which this Government belong, and who have thus made it possible for their party to come into office and establish this Government, to give heed to the opinion of those who are in support of it? They are governing not in the interests of Congress people alone. Having come into power, I say, it is their duty to take into account opinions expressed by any party or by any section of people.

" Sir, after all, with regard to the question of the introduction of Hindi or Hindustani, I know, the Hon. Premier has told us through his speeches at other places, that although Hindustani is introduced as a compulsory language in the schools, it would not be really compulsory, because it will not be taken into account at the time of examination, that is, if a student fails in the Hindustani language, his promotion will not be stopped. To that extent, the compulsory aspect of the question is minimized. When that can be done, I wish to ask, 'What is the loss if the Hon. the Premier takes away that compulsory aspect altogether?' There is feeling against that qualifying word. What exactly is lost by so doing? Well, he might give heed to the opinion and agree to take away the compulsory aspect for a time, and if the Hon. Premier takes away that compulsory aspect at the present moment, I suppose a time will come when the people themselves of their own accord may ask for compulsion. When they ask for compulsion, we may declare compulsion and make the language compulsory in the schools. After all, when we introduce any reform, we have to be very cautious. We have seen how the Hon. Minister for Public Health declared the other day that Government want to be very cautious in introducing new proposals, or for the matter of that any change in the administration. When they say that, I know they mean that they should not take a leap in the dark. I know the Hon. Premier is always very cautious. I know he always errs on the side of caution rather than on the side of persistence. But in this case, I fail to see, why he persists. Gentlemen who are fond of Tamil language, gentlemen who are anxious to keep Tamil language and see that it is not killed, gentlemen who want to see that that language is not adversely affected, are anxious that the Hindi language should not be made compulsory. When they say so, I believe they are honest; I believe they are sincere in what they say; and hence I believe the Hon. Premier should take that aspect of the question into account and take away the compulsory aspect altogther. Sir, this is so far as the compulsory side of the question is concerned.

[Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan] [18th August 1938

" Sir, a certain number of our countrymen, when they agitated against this by means of petitions and by means of meetings, found that these things had no effect upon the Hon. Premier, and so some of them resorted to picketing. I must condemn all that some of them had done while they loitered in front of the Premier's house shouting very objectionable slogans. They have, in my opinion, committed a wrong. It is certainly wrong for any person to go and stand opposite another's house, much less the house of a Member of Government, and shout and create disturbance and even to cry objectionable slogans. Certainly it is most objectionable. I certainly do not agree with those picketers who resorted to this sort of picketing and shouting slogans. But, for the offence they have committed in this manner, is it necessary, is it desirable, or is it right for a national Government to put these people down by having them arrested under a law, which has been condemned by themselves, which is to say the least lawless law, the most objectionable of the laws of the country—a law which ought to have been removed from the Statute Book long ago. The moment the Congress Government came into power, it should have been taken out of the Statute Book; but it has been allowed to remain, perhaps to be used against these very innocent persons. Sir, this law has been condemned from time to time, by Congressmen who were carrying on agitation against Government on the lines of Non-co-operation and picketing. Hon. Members belonging to the Congress Party and the Nationalist Party were opposed to the introduction of this law in the Central Legislature; they wanted it to be cancelled, for it was considered a satanic law, a lawless law. It is very unfortunate that that very satanic law has now become the law of the saint, the law of the angel; it has become an angelic law in the hands of the Congress Government, to be used against petty agitators. Petty agitators, I say, because they are merely a handful of persons picketing in front of the house of the Hon. the Premier or in front of a school where Hindi language has been introduced as a compulsory language. I know the Hon. Premier is a non-violent gentleman. If there is any gentleman who believes in non-violence to the extreme extent, it is my Hon. Friend, the Premier. He would not hurt even an ant that passes before him; he would not hurt anybody; he would avoid doing harm to anybody; and at the same time he would be tolerant to any amount of offence done to him. And I cannot understand how such a change came over such a gentleman the moment he assumed office. Now he cannot stand the sight of a batch of people standing in front of his house and shouting slogans. I know his ears were of such a nature that no noise could disturb his equanimity or upset his equilibrium of mind. The moment he has become the Minister, he cannot stand people loitering in front of his house and shouting. [The Hon. Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar: ' I have shown tolerance towards you

18th August 1938] [Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

now so long.' (Laughter.)] My hon. Friend cannot but be tolerant, I know; because there is the Speaker there to protect me. (Laughter.) (Rao Bahadur Sir A. T. Pannir Selvam: 'Hear, hear.') Perhaps if the Hon. Premier had not changed his tolerence this thing would not have happened. I am sure if he had overlooked this agitation, if he had not taken any notice of this agitation, perhaps the picketers would have stopped it themselves when they find that nobody was taking any notice of them. You know, the moment you use oppression against any agitation, that agitation grows in volume, grows in quality and grows in seriousness. I am afraid it is the Hon. Premier, who is to a very large extent responsible for the volume of agitation that is going on in this Presidency. If it had not been taken notice of, I am sure it might have lost its importance, and the agitation 6 p.m. would never have assumed the voluminous proportion it has now done. I do not know whether the Hon. the Premier believes that the noise which these people make is undesirable. I only wish that the Hon. the Premier leaves his quiet place in Bazlullah Street in Mambalam and takes his residence in China Bazaar Road. Then he would have known what noise is—the hooting of the horns of the several motor cars that pass to and fro, the noise due to running of the tram-cars and added to all these, the noise made by other conveyances and the noisy hawkers. All these noises that are a common affair to the residents in that locality, would certainly have upset the Hon. the Premier.

"I only wish that the Hon. the Premier comes forward and says that he is not responsible for the arrests of these people, and that the police who have to do their duty are responsible for the arrests of those gentlemen who were creating disturbance in the street and who were resorting to picketing in front of his house. But that, he cannot do. Because, he is not only the Premier but is also in charge of police. He cannot say that it is against his wish that the police have taken this action. I know that he governs and he is in charge of the police; therefore whatever the police does or does not do, the Hon. the Premier is either indirectly or directly, more indirectly than directly, held answerable. I am told that this agitation is a small agitation but that it is gaining ground. It is not only gaining ground but it is creating communal feeling, and it is creating communal trouble. I submit communal difference is becoming more and more acute on account of the persistence of the Hon. the Premier as well as the persistence of the Hon. the Minister for Education in making the study of Hindi compulsory. Therefore in order to avoid these unfortunate results of compulsory introduction of Hindi and making the question a very large one, and in order to prevent it developing into other questions that will ultimately be responsible for creating a very wide gulf between communities in this Province, I appeal to Hon. the Prime Minister to give up

compulsory introduction of Hindi. Thereby he will not lose anything. Hindi or Hindustani as it is called will be learnt by the people of this Province. They have been learning it. The Hindi Prachar Sabah has been doing this work of teaching people Hindi, and a large number of Hindus are learning this language.

"The Hon. the Premier in one of his speeches said that he was not against the non-Brahmans in compulsorily introducing Hindustani. If he had not made Hindustani compulsory, only the Brahmans will learn it and not the non-Brahmans. But as his desire was that the non-Brahmans also should learn Hindustani, he has made it compulsory."

The Hon. Mr. T. PRAKASAM:—"May I request the hon. Member through you, Sir, not to bring in here the question of Brahmans and non-Brahmans. I would request him to avoid that as far as possible, and it is the best thing under the circumstances."

* Mr. SPEAKER:—"It is a mere suggestion."

The Hon. Mr. T. PRAKASAM:—"Yes."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"On a point of order, Sir; I know it is a very unfortunate thing that I have to refer to that, because the Hon. the Premier in one of his speeches said —perhaps it was wrongly reported, and I shall be glad to stand corrected—that he was introducing this language compulsorily in the interests of the non-Brahmans. He said so. But now, it is the non-Brahmans that say that they do not want to study that language compulsorily."

The Hon. Mr. T. PRAKASAM:—"I must certainly request you, Sir, Mr. Speaker, to advise the hon. Member not to lay stress upon it. Even in one of the Provincial Legislatures—I believe it is in the Punjab—when questions were brought upon communal basis, they were stopped. So I request you not to allow this."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"It is not my purpose to create a division where it does not exist."

* Mr. SPEAKER:—"Is it not desirable to concentrate upon the subject-matter of the resolution?"

Rao Bahadur Sir A. T. PANNIR SELVAM:—"The question is not of . . ."

* Mr. SPEAKER:—"I think Sir Pannir Selvam may leave the matter between myself and the hon. Member, Mr. Hameed Khan."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Because it is not a question . . ."

* Mr. SPEAKER:—"It is advisable that the hon. Member does not refer to it again."

18th August 1938]

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"My respectful submission is that there is no question of creating a division where there is none. The division is there. What I say is 'don't make it worse. It is there, and you cannot deny the fact that it is there. It is growing . . ."

* Mr. SPEAKER:—"I think it is time that the hon. Member proceeds to other aspects of the question, because he has already taken a long time."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Yes, I shall try to go to some other point that I may have. (Laughter.)

"Sir, so far as the language is concerned, there is another aspect. I am a Mussalman. My second language is Hindustani or Urdu as I would call it."

The Hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Your mother-tongue is Hindustani." (Laughter.)

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"I am thankful to the Hon. Minister for Education. Because he is the Minister for Education, he must correct me (renewed laughter); and I am thankful to him for the correction.

"Sir, I am a Mussalman whose mother-tongue is Hindustani, that is to say, Urdu. There is a misunderstanding so far as our position is concerned in this matter of the language. So far as we are concerned, we the Mussalmans will be called upon to study this language which is called Hindustani in a different script, that is, in the Persian script. Whereas the other communities will be called upon to learn that language in the Devanagari script. Of course, so far as the scripts are concerned, there is a great controversy. It is one of the most difficult things about it. So far as we the Mussalmans are concerned the Hon. the Premier, at a certain stage at the time when we considered the Budget, told us definitely that the language that will be taught will be Hindustani that is being spoken in the streets of Delhi and Lucknow. With that assurance, we were certainly satisfied. But we have not yet seen the books that are said to be prepared by the Madras Government, which will be introduced in those schools. All of us, the Mussalmans, are still awaiting those books. But we are afraid that those books are of such a nature that will not satisfy the Mussalmans. So far as this question is concerned, if we consider that these books are not satisfactory, we will certainly not be a party to the introduction of this language, either compulsorily or voluntarily and its being learned by Urdu-speaking Mussalmans or any other Mussalmans. At present we, as a community, are not joining with those who have been agitating against the compulsory introduction of this language. But when we find that this language is different from the Urdu or Hindustani which is being spoken in the streets of

Delhi and Lucknow, we will swell the numbers of those who are now agitating against the introduction of this language either compulsorily or voluntarily in schools in the Madras Presidency.

"I now move the resolution."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I suppose Mr. Appadurai Pillai is practically withdrawing his motion? Both the resolutions relate to the same question, and when one is decided, either in the affirmative or in the negative, the other does not arise. It cannot be moved again."

DIWAN BAHADUR A. APPADURAI PILLAI:—"May I speak in support of this resolution?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"Yes. You can second the resolution now before the House."

* DIWAN BAHADUR A. APPADURAI PILLAI:—"Sir, I intended to move the resolution that stands in my name, namely,—

> '*that this Assembly recommends to the Government that the use of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act against persons who take part in the anti-Hindi agitation be disapproved.*'

"Since my friend Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan has moved his resolution, and since my resolution covers almost the same ground, I would content myself with seconding the resolution so ably moved by my friend.

"Sir, it is not my purpose to take the House into the history or the origin of this anti-Hindi agitation. Until about the last Budget Session, that is up to March 1938, there was not a whisper about the introduction of Hindi or Hindustani in our schools. It was only in the Hon. the Premier's speech when he presented the Budget for 1938–39 it was stated that among the new schemes of expenditure, provision has been made for the teaching of Hindustani in 125 Secondary schools in the Presidency. That was the first occasion when we came to know anything about Hindustani. This was then followed by a statement in the memorandum of explanations prepared by the Finance Secretary to the effect that provision has been made in the Budget for the introduction and for teaching Hindustani in Government Secondary schools; the same remark was repeated with reference to non-Government schools. In all these, there was no indication that Government have made up their minds to introduce Hindustani either as an optional subject or as a compulsory subject. A number of Members of this hon. House gave notice of cut motions to discuss the policy under 'Education' with reference to the compulsory introduction of Hindi in our schools. There was no regular discussion on it. Unfortunately owing to the temporary abstention on the part of some of the members on this side of the House there was no debate. Though some of the hon. Muslim members

18th August 1938] [Mr. A. Appadurai Pillai]

spoke on that discussion, as also my friend Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, several other members on this side of the House did not take part in the debate.

"It is not therefore correct to say that the matter was fully threshed out on the floor of the House during the budget session. There was no full dress debate. Nor was there a mandate from the people regarding the advisability of introducing Hindustani teaching. The matter was not placed in the form of a resolution nor was an appeal made to the public to give their sanction for the introduction of this measure. Sir, people came to know of this when the Government selected 125 schools for the introduction of Hindustani teaching. Seeing that Government seriously meant business, people protested as mildly as possible against this innovation. The press and the platform made a great deal of representation against this introduction of Hindustani. Seeing, Sir, that these protests from the press and the platform had not the desired effect, the sympathisers or advocates of the Dravidian literature took it into their heads to follow the method of peaceful picketing and procession. Sir, this peaceful picketing is considered to be in consonance with the orthodox form of agitation. Unfortunately, Sir, this peaceful picketing came to be viewed with displeasure, apparently due to unforeseen excesses on the part of some of the picketers. If, as Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan stated, the picketers transgressed their limits, if the processionists transgressed their line of demarcation and propriety, the ordinary law was open to Government to proceed against the malefactors. Unfortunately, at an ill-fated moment, the Government thought of stifling the agitation and nipping it in the bud by the application of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act. That leads us to the real point in this resolution. 6-15 p.m.

"The Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, as this hon. House knows, has acquired an evil reputation. It has been condemned as a pernicious piece of legislation which should be scrapped from the Statute Book at the earliest opportunity. If I am not wasting your time and the time of this hon. House, may I just refer very briefly to a few adverse remarks made by the hon. Members of the Central Legislative Assembly at the time this Bill was on the legislative anvil. Mr. B. Sitarama Raju characterized this Act, Sir, and incidentally the explanation appended to section 7 of the Act under which prosecutions are now launched, as a *fraud* upon the constitution. Mr. Jaggannath Agarwal characterized it as an *engine of oppression* in the hands of people who are vested with power. Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen went further and called it an *idotic* piece of legislation. Mr. Mody called it *silly* and *dangerous*. Mr. C. S. Ranga Ayyar characterized it in his own characteristic language as a *reprehensible* piece of legislation, reprehensible from the moderate and opposition point of view, reprehensible from the Congress point of

[Mr. A. Appadurai Pillai] [18th August 1938

view and reprehensible from the point of view of every lawyer and lover of the ordinary law. Mr. Amarnath Dutt called it, Sir, by a very unparliamentary name, *stupid*. That is the Act, Sir, which was put through the Central Legislature then."

THE HON. MR. C. RAJAGOPALACHARIAR:—"Is it open to me to suggest that he might proceed to quote from my speeches instead of from others?"

*DIWAN BAHADUR A. APPADURAI PILLAI:—"It was pushed through the legislature in these unenviable circumstances and this has been resorted to by this popular Government to enforce what is now known as the compulsory introduction of Hindustani. Sir, under clause (3), section 1, of this Act, it is stated that the Act shall remain in force for a period of three years from its commencement. Its commencement was on 19th December 1932. Naturally therefore, in the ordinary course of events, its life ought to have ceased on 19th December 1935. Knowing that it was not going to be extinct or rather apprehending that its life might probably be extended, Mr. B. Das, the Member from Orissa, a Congress Member, brought into the Central Legislature a measure purporting to repeal this Criminal Law Amendment Act. He introduced a Bill on 2nd September 1935. It came up for discussion both on 2nd September 1935 and on 17th September 1935 to 24th September 1935. Non-official days having expired, the Bill stood in an unfinished stage. Mr. Das could not get through the Bill repealing this pernicious Act of 1932. But Government were not quiet. They tried to bring in another Bill contrary to Mr. Das's Bill in order to make this Act permanent. On 2nd September 1935, they introduced a Bill in the Central Assembly and the Bill came up for discussion on 5th September 1935; it was debated upon on the 5th September and the following days, but on the 12th September 1935 it was given a decent burial by the Assembly members voting solidly against it. It is a matter of great pleasure to me, Sir, to find some of the illustrious names among those who voted down this Bill of Government intended to give the 1932 Act a permanent life. I find among those who voted against it Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, Mr. Avanashilingam Chettiyar, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, who are our honourable representatives in the Central Assembly at the present day. Among others we find the Hon. Dr. T. S. S. Rajan and the Hon. Mr. V. V. Giri who are at present gracing the treasury benches here. We find in their company Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami Raja who is a fellow member with me in this hon. House. We find, Sir, the name of Dr. N. B. Khare whose name unfortunately is on everybody's lips at the present moment. We find also the name of Mr. Satyamurti, the big gun of Madras. Seventy-one voted against the motion and sixty-one voted for it. But Government would not take the defeat lying down. They carried it to His Excellency the Viceroy who remitted it for reconsideration by the Assembly in

18th August 1938] [Mr. A. Appadurai Pillai]

an amended form. But the Assembly was not in a mood to accept even the amended Bill. The revised bill shared the fate of its predecessor. There was a debate and the bill was thrown out. That Bill was taken to the Council of State and was passed by that body, and signed by the President on the 28th September 1935, and His Excellency the Viceroy certified it on 4th October 1935, and it has now got into the statute book.

" With this chequered career which does not redound to its credit, the Act managed to secure a place on the statute book. But, unfortunately, Sir, the success on the part of this ill-fated Act of 1935 giving a permanent life to the Act of 1932 was very short-lived because in 1937, hardly two years later, the Act of 1935 was wholly repealed. Apart from this trouble, Sir, there is a little more storm in the tea-cup. Under the previous Government of India Act, section 67-B, when an Act is assented to by one chamber and thrown out by the other, it is up to His Excellency the Viceroy to certify that Act and bring it into operation. His Excellency the Viceroy accordingly granted the certification; but that certification should be subject to the condition that the certified Act is placed before both Houses of Parliament for about two weeks when the Parliament is in session. Otherwise it can be certified only as an emergency measure. Just at the time the Act was passed in 1935, the Parliament was in session for a number of days. The House of Lords also sat from the 27th October to 17th December 1935 and the House of Commons sat for a similar period.

" But His Excellency the Viceroy preferred to take action under the proviso to section 69-B and certified the Act as an emergency measure. 6-30 p.m.

" This Act of 1935 was however short-lived, as stated already, because it was wholly repealed in the year 1937. What is the result of this repeal? The result of the repeal of the Act of 1935 is to restore the *status quo ante.* That means that the Act of 1932 will remain unaffected by the Act of 1935. If it remains unaffected, if we forget for a moment that the 1935 Act does not exist, it brings us to the position that the Act of 1932 would function only for a period of three years with reference to cluase 3 of section 1. That is until 19th December 1935. That date having passed, the 1932 Act dies of its own accord. That is the fate of this Act. Sir I cannot imagine how the legal advisers of Government have advised Government to proceed under this Act which is not on the statute book. If we contend that the Act of 1935, which removed the word ' temporary ' from the preamble and omitted the words ' for a period of three years ' in clause 3 of section 1, conferred upon the original Act of 1932 a permanent lease of life, we would be unduly straining the law. Can it be argued that the original Act continues to subsist? By what stretch of imagination, Sir, can we concede that the 1932 Act has become permanent

on the statute book in spite of the amending Act having been repealed? Sir, this is at least a debatable point.

" Apart from this, there is the notification. Section 4 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act which deals with picketing of public servants has been deleted by the Act of 1935. Under section 7 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, clause (*a*) deals with intimidation, violence and obstruction; clause (*b*) deals with the offence of loitering. This clause has come handy to Government to put down anti-Hindi agitation. Sir, seeing that this sub-clause involves very serious responsibility and relates to offences of considerable importance, the Government of India took care to provide in clause 4, section 1 of the Act of 1932 that section 7 will not apply as a matter of course to the provinces, but that a notification should be published by the provincial Government introducing that section specifically to any area that may be determined by the local Government. It was with reference to this direction in clause 4, that the local Government published a notification in December 1932 applying section 7 to this province. It is by virtue of that section and under that notification that prosecutions were launched during the Civil Disobedience Movement. When the Act of 1932 was scrapped from the Statute Book by the later Act of 1937 as I submitted just now, the notification which partakes of the same nature as that of the original Act; cannot have more force of law than the original Act itself and it *ipso facto* ceases. The notification, Sir, will be of no value after the Act on which it was based had been cancelled. It would therefore seem, Sir, that neither the Act nor the notification issued under section 7 of the Act will validly grant sanction to the local Government to proceed against persons taking part in the anti-Hindi movement. After all, Sir, no law was broken. The anti-Hindi agitators. . . ."

THE HON. MR. C. RAJAGOPALACHARIAR:—" Excuse me for a minute, Sir. I did not wish to interrupt the hon. Member, but he is urging a point when, as the Leader of the House, I must draw your attention to the fact that he has just trenched on what is not right. I think he was arguing all the time about the repressive character of the measure or about the objectionable character of the measure. I think he ought not to proceed beyond that into a pleading with regard to the cases that are pending."

MR. SPEAKER:—" He is not dealing with matters that are *sub judice*."

THE HON. MR. C. RAJAGOPALACHARIAR:—" I thought I heard him say, or I should be corrected, that the notification is not now applicable and has no effect. After hearing that I thought I should rise."

MR. SPEAKER:—" I think he will not be impinging upon matters that are *sub judice*."

18th August 1938]

* DIWAN BAHADUR A. APPADURAI PILLAI :—" I have carefully avoided mentioning it. I am not going to dwell upon it. I shall take the advice of the Hon. the Premier. I shall not trench upon any matter that is *sub judice.*

" Would the Government, Sir, elect to base a policy of repression on an Act which found no equal in the matter of its universal condemnation? I leave it at that, Sir.

" Then with reference to the repressive character of the measures taken by Government to put a stop to this agitation I may refer to none else than Pandit Hrydayanath Kunzru who recently presided over a conference of the Hindi Pracharak Sabha and complimented the organisers of the conference on the success they have attained in the matter of the spread of Hindi education. He said: ' 69,715 candidates appeared for the examinations in Hindi. Judging the populartiy of Hindi in South India from the progress of the work of the Hindi Pracharak Sabha, I feel that more progress has been made than might have been expected.' That is the testimony of an outsider and an unbiassed gentleman to the spread of Hindi in our province. But with reference to the repressive measures he stated that if Hindi is not merely to be learnt, but has to be loved and remembered and its study has to be properly developed in South India, compulsion in regard to its study is out of place. Persuasion is the best way of achieving the desired result. The ' Madras Mail ' quoted with approval Pandit Kunzru's observations in these words:—

' Pandit Kunzru, whose disinterestedness is patent, told the Hindi Pracharak Sabba meeting at which he presided yesterday that compulsion was out of place. He shared this opinion with Mr. Giri who told a Chingleput audience that what is done by coercion will not last long.'

" It was not my intention, Sir, to rope in the Minister; but the ' Madras Mail ' had roped him in. I have with me several opinions from other illustrious persons supporting my view. But I do not wish to take up the time of the House by quoting from them all. Sir, various journals have also criticized the action of this Government. ' The Pioneer ' and ' the Bombay Chronicle ' have done so.

" Then, Sir, what is more painful with reference to these repressive measures is the punishment awarded for loitering. Loitering, Sir, is a very vague term. It has not been defined in any code. Anything can be considered as loitering. Walking in front of any Member's house can be deemed an offence and charged. And what is worse? People have been charged for abetment of loitering. In order to help the authorities to do so, they have had recourse to the unwholesome principle of combining section 117 of the Indian Penal Code with section 7 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, loitering and abetment of loitering. Recourse has thus been had to a combination of the Penal Code and the Criminal Law Amendment Act to punish innocent and

peaceful picketers who have done all this for love of their language. But what is the result of all this repression? Three months of incessant repression has only succeeded in filling the jails as rapidly as Government emptied them of criminals, political or otherwise. What has been done with one hand has been replaced by another.

" Sir, it is often said that this agitation is political in its aspect. What political aspect can a peaceful agitation have, Sir? I have already submitted that if the picketers have transgressed the law, they ought to be proceeded against under the ordinary provisions of Criminal Law.

" Sir P. T. Rajan, a descendant of a patron of Tamil literature, a direct descendant, whose ancestor has been immortalized in the famous epic which we Tamilians revere as Kamba Ramayanam, has distinctly stated that it is only the love of language that has induced him to take part in this agitation. It is not communal either, because Brahmans, non-Brahmans, Muslims and Christians have joined in the agitation."

6-45 p.m. MR. SPEAKER :—" I suppose that the hon. Member has taken more than an hour."

* DIWAN BAHADUR A. APPADURAI PILLAI :—" I will finish, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I think that is better."

* DIWAN BAHADUR A. APPADURAI PILLAI :—" Sanyasins have taken part in this, people who have renounced the world and have taken to Kashayam. What benefit can they have expected. Sir, in the matter of politics? They have given up everything. They have given up home; they have given up the luxuries of the world; they have renounced this life and why should they take part in this agitatition on political or communal grounds? It is nothing but love of language. It is not that we are unaware of the fact that the Tamilians have a great tradition and it is not necessary for me to read the opinion of an English writer with reference to this point. That would probably be carrying coals to Newcastle. But it deals with the very point that I am trying to labour at the present moment. Mr. F. W. Thomas has stated, Sir, in the famous book called ' the Legacy of India ' thus: ' The Tamil is undoubtedly next to the Sanskrit the greatest Indian literature. The note of this Tamil hymnology is all-renouncing, enthusiastic devotion to the chosen divinity, Siva or Vishnu; the poetic style is more elaborate even than that of Sanskrit. The Tamils are conscious of the value of their literary inheritance, and they maintain a tradition of its regulation from very remote periods by successive ' Academies ' sitting in judgment at Madura, which is still the great centre of Tamil studies.' It is this consciousness which is at the root of all this trouble. I leave it there Is it any wonder, Sir, that the Tamils,

18th August 1938] [Mr. A. Appadurai Pillai]

the people of South India, without any distinction of caste or creed have joined in this agitation? The solution is in the hollow of the Prime Minister's hands. It is possible, Sir, at a moment's notice to put an end to the whole trouble by declaring the teaching of Hindi as optional. Would anything be lost by that method? We find the text-books are not ready; Sir, though 125 schools were selected for the introduction of Hindi, it was found possible to introduce it only in 65 schools because pandits were not forthcoming; it was necessary to reduce the qualification of the Pandits in order to enable them to be posted as teachers in these 65 schools. That being the case, as the arrangements are not perfect, and the people are not satisfied and ready at the present moment, would it be too much to ask this popular Government to consider the case from a sympathetic point of view and make this teaching of Hindi optional? Sir, the same object will be attained in course of time. As my hon. Friend, Mr. Hameed Khan, has stated, people will go in voluntarily for the learning of Hindi, if a certain amount of preferential treatment is shown to the persons who are literate in Hindi. It is just possible to encourage the study of Hindi by means of scholarships, stipends and by giving preferential treatment in the matter of appointments. But to try to force it upon a people who are legitimately or otherwise alarmed at the probable harm that it might do, would it be feasible, Sir? Would it be desirable to persist in a measure of this kind? Will it be too much, Sir, to appeal to the Hon. Premier to see that peace is restored and to see that those who have been incarcerated for no fault of theirs except probably for love of language released and restored to the parental roofs?

"I must mention in this connexion, Sir,—otherwise I would be failing in my duty—one word about the punishments that are being awarded to the so-called agitators. Sanyasins have been punished with rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year. The Act provides for a sentence of imprisonment or fine. Fine could have been imposed or imprisonment for a small term; why go beyond the necessities of the case, the requirements of justice? If a month or two is awarded, it might be possible to bring about a settlement within that period but a year's rigorous imprisonment and nine months' rigorous imprisonment for that matter merely for the infringement of an executive order seems rather harsh. Sir, with these words, I commend the resolution for the acceptance of the House. I am sure that if freedom of vote is given, a large number of members would vote for the resolution." (Cries of 'no, no.')

Mr. R. M. PALAT:—"I have no doubt, Sir, that several hon. Members of this House . . . "

Mr. SPEAKER:—"The two hon. Members who have spoken already have taken between themselves much more than an hour

and the time before the House is very limited; and there are a number of other resolutions also. And it may not be possible at all to reach the other resolutions. Even then in order to allow an opportunity for a substantially good number of people to speak on this resolution, I think hon. Members hereafter must be content to make short speeches, pointed and relevant to the subject-matter."

* MR. R. M. PALAT:—" Sir, I presume that nobody will deny that Mr. Gandhi is the best exponent of congress principles and his main test to see whether the Government in any of the congress provinces has been a success or not, is this: I believe it is in the Harijan of the 23rd April, that he stated: the success of any of these Governments should be measured by the extent—in inverse proportion—of the force used in these provinces. Sir, what do we see in this presidency? Do we see any reduction in the amount of force which is used by this the first popular government against peaceful agitators from what was used by the old bureaucratic or dyarchic systems of government? (Interruption.) Sir, I cannot hear an interruption which has been made but I go on with what I have to say. The Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari said yesterday that we should credit him with honest motives. I am quite prepared to do so. But, Sir, let us look at what has happened. It is seen that the Congress Government is actually killing the national movement in India. Has he done anything to fight against the larger imperialistic interests in this country? Has he done anything in fulfilment of any of his pledges? In the last 50 years, this is the first time that there has been no national opposition to the British Government? I challenge Mr. Rajagopalachariar to deny that. According to what Mr. Gandhi has laid down, I should have thought that those who believe in Congress principles should offer non-violent satyagraha towards these anti-Hindi agitators instead of trying to arrest them and put them into jail. I do not want to take more time, after what has been so fully dealt with by my predecessor, Mr. Appadurai Pillai."

MR. M. AHMED BADSHA:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I take your advice and I shall be very brief in supporting the resolution of my friend Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan. Sir, at the time when the Government contemplated the introduction of compulsory Hindustani in this Province, they, I imagine, could never have dreamt that any opposition could have been raised on this issue. They introduced it hoping that it would have smooth sailing but if they had thought that there would have been such an opposition, the usual care shown in the promulgation of the Prohibition Act and the Act that they have said they have been contemplating to introduce for the freedom of temple-entry to the depressed classes in Malabar, would have been shown in the introduction of Hindustani compulsorily. Sir, in speaking on this resolution

18th August 1938] [Mr. M. Ahmed Badsha]

I respectfully draw the attention of the Hon. the Prime Minister that a difference should be made between compulsion and necessity. I have yet to understand, Sir, in the history of languages that I have had opportunities of studying that at any time any language had been introduced on the basis of compulsion."

AN HON. MEMBER:—" English? "

MR. M. AHMED BADSHA:—" English is a necessity again, Sir."

AN HON. MEMBER:—" Hindi also."

MR. M. AHMED BADSHA:—" Sir, we admit that India is a vast continent, that India is peopled by diverse classes and communities and that we should have a language for the general unification of this vast continent. (Hear, hear.) All that is admitted, Sir, but is such a necessity being felt to-day or was it at any time felt before? So far as I am aware and I have got history to support me, this necessity was felt so long ago as when the Bijapur and the Golconda Empires were built in South India. It must have been several hundreds of years ago that Hindustani was introduced first as the necessary language of the fighting units of their kingdoms. The armies of Bijapur and Golconda consisted of innumerable units of various classes of persons drawn from various parts of this country and in their movements for conquering purposes throughout the country, they had to come across hundreds of languages and necessity compelled these forces to evolve a common language in those circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the evolution of that language has given us the Hindustani that is being spoken commonly to-day.

" Sir, there is an allied word also used in reference to that language, viz., Urdu. The word Urdu, I may say for the information of the House, if I am not considered impertinent, signifies a military camp. It was necessity which laid the foundations of that language and led to its development to such an extent that we have got nearly 20 crores of people talking Hindustani all over India. (Applause) I now appeal to the Government to say whether this development of 20 crores of people speaking this language in India has been reached out of compulsion or necessity. The very fact that the Government is introducing Hindustani to-day on a compulsory basis is an admission of the fact that there is no necessity for it. If there was the necessity the element of compulsion had no reason to come in. It is just like a man who has been hungry and has been fed, who has been thirsty and whose thirst has been quenched and therefore cannot be expected to relish any more food or drink however delicious it might be. What we oppose not the introduction of Hindi or Hindustani but the compulsory aspect of the measure. I would welcome any propaganda being

7 p.m.

made or any encouragement being given for the study of Hindustani for nationalizing the language of this continent. But I should fall back and hesitate not once but a hundred times before I could ever think of introducing anything like compulsion.

" Sir, I am a Mussalman and there is no doubt about it although I may be laughed at by some hon. Members for my views. According to the Koran it is God who is said to be the teaching source of all languages. It says 'that he taught man to speak.' Speech never came by artificial applications or devices. Speech is the development that comes out of social, political or economic necessity. If we are to study a language like German, text-books might be helpful to us, instructors might be helpful to us, but so long as there is no necessity to foster the language and develop it, the learning of it will become difficult. The time and energy that might be spent in the studying of a language under circumstances of necessity will be quite insignificant when compared to the time taken under compulsion. Should I not therefore be considered relevant if I ask that if the Government are anxious to introduce a national language why they should not take on hand a language that has been developed and evolved already after long experience and as a result of the cultural development of the two great people of this country—Hindus and Mussalmans—a language which has come to be known as Urdu? Urdu has advanced to such an extent, as the Hon. the Premier himself has admitted at one time, that there are about 20 crores of people speaking that language all over India. If we are to complete that achievement of developing a national language it will be but a step further if Urdu is made to advance in the usual course instead of introducing a disturbing current in the shape of Hindi, and much more so in the shape of compulsory study of Hindi.

" I am not going to dwell on the other aspects of the repression, but I would respectfully point out this. I have read the speech of the Hon. the Premier at the meeting held on the beach as was reported in the Madras Mail. The Hon. the Premier asked whether he should drop the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act when such a dropping would be suicidal to his own policy. The illustration that he gave was: Are we to give up Fort St. George, because it was built by the British? Well, Sir, I do not want to dilate upon this illustration, but I fail to see how it answers the difficulty or applies to the present position. Both these things, the Criminal Law Amendment Act and Fort. St. George, might have had their origin from a Government of the past whom we have supplanted. Sir, am I not right in asking whether the purpose was the same in both the cases? It is the application that has been objected to. I fail to understand how

18th August 1938] [Mr. M. Ahmed Badsha]

when Fort. St. George had been built for the good governance of the people it could be compared to the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act for the purpose of repression. Therefore, Sir, I humbly request that the Government should not only drop this repression but also consider the question of abolishing the compulsory introduction of the study of Hindi." (Applause.)

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir."

Mr. SPEAKER :—" A very brief speech of only five minutes."

* Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" It is hard lot on me that I should confine my speech to five minutes. Sir, it is with a certain amount of trepidation that I rise to participate in this discussion. I submit, Sir, even at the outset that I am unable to agree with the resolution or even the language of it. The resolution reads :

'This Assembly recommends to the Government to stop its policy of repression against persons who take part in the anti-Hindi agitation.'

" Now so far as I have been able to watch the events that have been taking place for the past few months I do not think, Sir, it can be correctly described that a repressive policy is being adopted against those who are participating in the anti-Hindi agitation. True, there have been trials and convictions and it might also be said that in certain cases the sentences have been severe. But the convictions have not been merely because those persons have participated in the anti-Hindi agitation, but because the offences for which they have been tried and convicted are offences of the kind which no hon. Member of this House could tolerate. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I stand for individual liberty. I stand for agitation on constitutional lines. I stand for agitation on the same lines and principles which the Congress has taught the people of this country for the past fifty years. But, Sir, that agitation must have a righteous cause for its basis. It must be based on something which ordinary human reason can accept. It is indisputable that the repression so called has not been against the people who march in processions carrying placards and shouting slogans against the spread of Hindustani in the country. Nor has there been any repressive policy adopted against persons who have spoken at meetings or protested in writing in the Press. The convictions have been of persons who have caused annoyance, intimidation and unnecessary interference with individual liberty and made the life of people against whom they were directed miserable. (Hear, hear.) Now, Sir, that kind of agitation no person who respects law would be able to put up with. Sir, I submit in all humility that I beg to differ from my hon. Friends the mover and the supporters of this Resolution. The Resolution as it has been framed does not correspond to the actual facts. That is my humble submission.

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [18th August 1938

" My hon. Friend the Muslim Member from North Arcot said that he was only concerned with the compulsory aspect of this question. There might be some semblance of justification for that. But, I earnestly ask: granting there is some element of compulsion in the step taken by the Government of the day, are the methods adopted by the people who agitate against that compulsion the right methods? Are they constitutional methods? Are they within the scope of the law? I concede that every one who feels aggrieved can protest against compulsion according to his lights. But the protest should stop within reasonable bounds. If there has been a constitutional protest, certainly it would have been justifiable. That amount of protest which a man of reason makes against compulsion will not bring him within the clutches of the law. The arm of the ordinary law is not so long as to extend against persons who in the name of protest against compulsion commit atrocious acts. In this connexion, Sir, I venture to submit that very few of the Muslim Members have thought over the issues involved in the question of the compulsory spread of Hindustani. I contend that very few indeed have devoted any attention to the real aspect, the vital nature of this question so far as it affects the Muslim community. Sir, it has been claimed and rightly too that Hindustani is a Muslim language. May I, by the way state that the Government in their orders and responsible Ministers in their speeches have abandoned the use of the word 'Hindi' and have become acclimatized to the use of the word 'Hindustani'? Now, Sir, Hindustani is the language spoken in the cities of Lucknow, Delhi and Allahabad and that is the language spoken by several of us though in a broken fashion in the South of India. That is the language spoken by the Pathans and Deccanis. A very large proportion of the Mussalmans of South India—the Mappillas of Malabar, the Rowthers and the Maracairs—do not yet speak that language. Some smattering of that language is seen only in the Andhra Province. So, what is spoken is the Hindustani language that is sought to be propagated. Sir, so far as the script is concerned, in North India there had been a very keen agitation for long as to whether it should be the Nagari script or the Arabic script. It was stated that at one time even Mahatma Gandhi objected to the use of the Arabic script. But, Sir, that has become a thing of the past. Gandhiji, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and a host of other leaders some of whom were thinking that Nagari should be the popular script have given up the idea because they found it impossible or difficult to develop a new language in a script which has not had sufficient foundation. Now, Sir, by common consent, the language is to be the common language; the script is to be whatever the individual chooses for himself. Now, Sir, on the authority of the Anjumane-Tharaki-ye-Urdu which had its headquarters at Aurangabad and which has shifted itself now to Delhi, I am entitled to say that the question of script

18th August 1938] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

has been settled once for all. There is no more controversy over this. The language is one, the scripts are two.

"Now, Sir, this Government want to propagate this spoken language which is a Muslim language. It is up to the Mussalmans to say ' we welcome this movement '. (Applause.) ' We shall avail ourselves of the opportunity and get facilities, as many facilities as possible, from the Government for the early and speedy learning of this language by the 11 or 12 lakhs of Moplahs in Malabar and the 11 and 12 lakhs of Mussalmans in Tamil Nadu, and an equal number in the Andhra and the Kanarese areas.' Instead of saying that we should be provided with more and more teachers for the learning of this language in the Urdu script, that we should be given greater and greater facilities in the schools maintained by the Government, by the municipalities and district boards all over the country, it is most unfortunate that Mussalmans have been misled into joining hands with an agitation which ought not to be supported by any Muslim. My honest conviction is that and I warn my Muslim brethren and the Muslim community in general—I speak, Sir, with a full sense of my responsibility when I say that they will be committing another big mistake of their life if they are going to be misled by socalled leaders and if they are going to serve as spokes in the wheel of the spread of Hindustani in this province. Sir, when the English language has been made compulsory and also a pre-requisite for entry into service, entry into political and any kind of public life, are Mussalmans in this age under false leadership, not going to allow the members of their community to learn the language of the country and of the future? Sir, it was given to the late Sir Sayed Ahmed Khan—honoured be his memory—to point out to the Mussalman community ' that they were going to lose all if they were not going to take to English education and the English language.' Much precious time was lost and what was lost has not been made up yet by the Mussalman community in spite of strenuous efforts. To-day, Sir, the Mussalman community stands as a backward community in every respect. Time and again we have to jump up in this House in order to ask for more and more privileges and facilities for the spread of modern education among the Muslim community. Sir, it is not a very happy thing for us to do. This day, I have had to ask the Hon. the Minister for Education as to why Muslim schools are being abolished, why Arabic Munshis are being sent away and so on and so forth. That is not always a very pleasant thing to do. All the same, owing to the mistake committed by our forefathers and our predecessors, we have perforce to do all these things. Now is the time to wake up and put forth all endeavour in the hope that with the co-operation of this Government, we would make all progress and ere long the Muslim community would be on the same level as the other

7-15 p.m.

communities in the matter of education. I am afraid, Sir, that a similar mistake which will enure for their lives will be committed by the Muslim community to-day, if they are not going to take this opportunity by the forelock and say to the municipalities, the local boards and to the Government, 'Give us more Hindustani teachers, and we want to learn the language in the Urdu script.' Why not say it? Some Muslims know Hindustani already; my friend from Kistna says 'only a miscroscopic minority.' Sir, it may be a microscopic minority; but I ask my Friend in all humility whether, if the 12 lakhs of Muslims in Malabar do not know Hindustani and if the several lakhs of Muslims in the Tamil Nadu and other areas do not know it, this is not a splendid opportunity to make up the lee-way and whether this opportunity should be lost under false leadership and wrong advice. I submit, Sir, there being no compulsion whatsoever in the matter of the script, there can be no justification for Mussalmans for participating in this unwarranted agitation. There has been a mistaken impression going round that the books will be written in the Hindi language, as opposed to the Urdu language. This is merely a confusion born of ignorance and prejudice. The language is one and there is no difference in the spoken language. Sir, a start has been made with the first reader that is to be introduced in the schools in furtherance of the programme of the Government; it will be a common text written in two different scripts, perhaps under the supervision of no greater a person than Abdul Kalam Azad against whom there may be several allegations made now by his mean opponents. I have already had the Nagari text read to me; but I see the Urdu text now for the first time, given to me by Dr. Subbarayan. I had my friend Mr. Sastri to read to me the Nagari text, and I found in it no Sanskrit words. This is only the initial stage. This book which is written in the Nagari script and the one which I hold in my hand written in the Arabic script are both the same, so far as the matter goes, and I have no reason to believe, so far as things stand at present, that the authority that has been constitued. . ."

Mr. MAHBOOB ALI BAIG :—"On a point of order, Sir. Is this all relevant to the question before us—this lecture on the merits of Hindustani and otherwise?"

Mr. SPEAKER :—"It is not a point of order."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—"I was saying, Sir, that there is no indication, and there is no justification either, to suspect that in the future, the authority that has been constituted to write books, common text-books for the spread of Hindustani in this province, is going to take a different turn and put in a large number of Sanskrit words in the common text-books in such a way as to make Hindustani or Arabic suffer. This is a very

18th August 1938] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

mistaken impression. On the other hand, if the language that is spoken now in Delhi, Lucknow and Allahabad, is the language that is to be propagated in this presidency, there is absolutely no room for the suspicion, that Sanskrit words are going to be introduced. And who are the authors of this book, leave alone Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad who has been caluminated as having been purchased by the Congress for all his life? All stalwart Muslims who represent the height of Muslim culture, Muslim language and Muslim literature in this country, have supported this movement, as being well-conceived. One of them is the Secretary of the Anjumani-Taraki-Ye-Urdu, a revered friend of mine and some others too in this part of the country. He has agreed with me that there is no more room for agitation on the ground of either Sanskrit script or Arabic script. On the other hand, as I said, if Mussalmans are wise, they will catch hold of this opportunity, lose no time and put the Government in the wrong as often as possible by their making demands for the grant of greater and greater facilities for learning this language in all the schools of our province. I admit, at the same time, that there are practical difficulties in the matter of the spread of Hindustani, but it is up to the Mussalmans to see that these difficulties are surmounted; as Mussalmans are few, the Government may not be able to make adequate arrangements for the teaching of Hindustani in the Arabic script. In a school administered, say by a district board or a municipality, on account of want of adequate funds and financial stringency, such a facility may not be possible, and that is why a person knowing both the scripts may be required to be employed; but I am sure nothing prevents the majority in a school from learning it in the Arabic script or the Nagari script or in whatever script they please. It is therefore up to the Mussalmans to say if they choose to, that they do not want the Nagari script, that they want to learn the language only in the Urdu script; and that therefore they should be given facilities for the purpose. And if the municipality or the local body does not rise to the occasion, the Government may be approached for help. In such a case, let the Government come to our help. It will not be an item that could be objected to by the Accountant-General; no audit objection could be raised on that score. The Public Accounts Committee also will not take objection to any such expenditure for the spread of Urdu which is sanctioned by the Government and by this House. On the other hand, as I said, it will be to our detriment, to the detriment of the progress of the Muslim language and the Muslim community in this province, if we should participate in the anti-Hindi agitation. It is sheer folly to say that agitators who cross the bounds of decency and indulge in intimidation and vulgar abuse should not be booked.

"There is also an argument advanced that the local language, the mother-tongue—probably Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam or

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [18th August 1938

Kanarese—will be affected. But no Muslim has spoken that Malayalam is going to be affected, or that Tamil is going to be affected or Telugu or Kanarese. Not at all. It is futile to argue on these lines. There is no warrant for this. On the other hand, as I understand the Government's programme, the counterpart of the spread of Hindustani in this province will be that instruction will be given in all the subjects in our schools through the medium of the mother-tongue. If both these parts are kept together, and if the students and pupils are going to be given instruction in their own mother-tongue, whatever language it may be, then the spread of the Hindustani language in any script cannot kill or interfere in any manner whatever with the spread and development of the mother-tongue. If this is true then the agitation is sheer perversity and must be put down. Sir, we in the University, have had occasion to impress upon the institutions amenable to our control that there should be persuasion as much as possible exercised through the respective administrations, in order to make students take to answering questions at examinations in the vernacular itself; and as a result of that persuasion, there are now nearly 150 to 180 institutions where students have taken to answering their examinations in their own mother-tongue. But this indeed is very slow progress. Compulsion must accelerate this. Similarly, if the Muslims had taken up that kind of agitation and stated that every Muslim child, wherever he might be, must learn the Hindustani language, certainly things would have been much easier and progress would have been tremendous. That was not done, and we have failed in our duty, and the Government have now come forward to our rescue and given us this opportunity. Why not avail of it and why not make the best use of it? That is my simple question to my Muslim brethren. What is it that they lose that they should think of supporting a movement directed against the spread of their own language?

"Again, Sir, the Tamil language has no reason to fear. It is already making headway in the institutions and it will not cease to exercise the healthy influence that it does now, to attract the fascination and the imagination of those people who are acquainted with it and who are intent upon developing it. It may be true that some of the Ministers themselves have not so far acquainted themselves with the Hindustani language, and it may be that Ministers have failed in their duty. It may be that some Ministers have merely supported, but done substantially nothing for the spread of Tamil; but all that is not germane to the issue now before us. The Ministers will very soon learn the Hindustani language. They will speak it very soon, and I hope so. But I know there are Ministers here, if I may be permitted to say so, who are actively encouraging in their individual capacity, I mean in their personal capacity and also in their official capacity, the spread of the mother-tongue. I know instances, but I do not

18th August 1938] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

want to quote them here. All this fear that Tamil or any other language of the province will be seriously affected by the propagation of the Urdu or the Hindustani language is certainly groundless, and merely a cloak for agitation. It is a poor pretext.

" Sir, already the Hon. the Premier has undertaken and assured us in unmistakable terms that he would very soon try to repeal the Criminal Law Amendment Act and bring in measures which would have the consent or sanction of this very House, for being applied to cases which demand the application of such measures. So, the real point is only a question of time. I do not think it is proper to say that there has been a repressive policy at all. The repression is not against persons who express honest views, not against those who want honest views to spread or who want to mould public opinion in that direction, but only against those who do things which ought not to be allowed to be done, which endanger personal security and personal liberty and excite feelings of hatred and who want to get a name eventually. I want to tell the hon. Member from North Arcot who said that compulsion is different from necessity, that I cannot appreciate the difference. What is compulsion to-day may be necessity to-morrow. If it is necessary to-morrow, I say, why not have it to-day by means of compulsion. Sir, I warn the Muslim community and other communities also, that within the next five or ten years, if not this Government, some other Government which may be then in power, will make this language a pre-requisite for entry into service—that is, a knowledge of Hindustani in the Nagari script or the Urdu script. Then, who will be the losers? Those friends of mine who have already learnt the language would naturally stand to gain, while my Muslim friends who support this unrighteous agitation and their dependants would be completely left behind. I warn them, therefore, that the time has come when every one of us must learn it either in the Urdu script or in the Nagari script and not support the agitation against Hindustani. There is no mincing matters here. I am sure that if I am in the Government, if I take up the reins of Government at any time, I would certainly prescribe such a qualification. And what will be the position of my friends then who are now opposing it, and who are not prepared to avail themselves of this opportunity? I suggest, therefore, that it is very necessary that we should evolve a common tie—and, one of the biggest and the most important ties is a common language. And if this tie of a common language is absent or lacking, then it will take us years and years to come together, and to be called and respected as a nation. Sir, it is said that there is no need for a common language, that the need was there many years ago, but that it is not present to-day. I submit, in all humility, that the need has become all the greater to-day than at any time before in order that we should understand

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [18th August 1938

each other and come closer together. If I am to address an audience, I have to speak in a foreign language . . ."

7-30 p.m. MR. SPEAKER:—" I suppose the hon. Member is only elaborating the point. He should deal with the matter of repression. After all, this is incidental, though relevant enough."

MR. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED;—" I submit, Sir, that the development of the Urdu language either is not going to be affected."

MR. SPEAKER:—" Urdu or Hindi, that is no doubt relevant. But you cannot take up so much time upon harping on the matter."

MR. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" It is said that the Urdu language is not to-day well developed and that it is likely to be affected by the present movement of the Government . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—" Urdu or Hindi will take care of itself."

MR. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" I agree with you, Sir. I submit that such notions are due to misapprehension. It is not possible at this late stage to develop altogether a new language and a new vocabulary, a new grammar and a new diction. It is impossible in modern days to do it. If any section of the Congress organization is trying to do it, it will be an utter failure. I therefore submit that this agitation is not based on righteousness nor on any just cause. This agitation against the spread of Hindustani is not on a sound basis. It is not warranted. It is stated that the only thing that is objected to is compulsion. That compulsion has been minimised to such an extent, that it means no compulsion really. In so far as it is not going to be made a test for the purpose of promotion where is the compulsion? The methods to ward off compulsion are different from what have been now adopted by the agitators. Let them not send their sons to schools if they choose. Let them take to other means of expressing their dissent from that compulsion. But so long as it is not going to be a test for promotion, where is the wrong in it, and where is the compulsion. Compulsion is completely done away with in a way. I am for compulsion. In this country where Hindus and Mussalmans have lived all along in conservation no reform will be possible without a certain amount of compulsion and from that point of view compulsion is necessary and that compulsion must be by slow stages and the Government is doing but the right thing in having introduced Hindustani only for the first three forms. The said compulsion only amounts to this that it shall be studied, but it shall not be a *sine qua non*, for promotion.

" Sir, I submit that this resolution is not well conceived. It is not in the interests of the Muslim community and of any community whatsoever for the matter of that; and it is misconceived." (Loud laughter.)

18th August 1938]

* KHAN BAHADUR P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB BAHADUR:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, coming as I do after the long speech of my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed, who is the representative of the Mussalmans of South Arcot district, I really feel that the warning that he has given to the community is meant not only to his constituency of South Arcot, not only to the Muslim community of Madras, but to the entire Muslim community of the whole of India. He is a great warner and I am sure this warning is not all required by the community to which I have the honour to belong. As the Hon. Speaker very rightly pointed out he was keeping this House for nearly an hour by irrelevant talk not touching the point which is the subject-matter of the resolution which reads 'This Assembly recommends to the Government to stop its policy of repression against persons who take part in the anti-Hindi agitation.' It was very rightly pointed out that the question before the House was not the question of compulsory introduction of Hindi or non-compulsory introduction of Hindi, but the question was the policy of repression against the persons who took part in the anti-Hindi agitation. If I rise to speak on this occasion, Sir, I do so in order to support the proposition that is before the House, and I do so with all the weight that I can command. First of all, Sir, I beg to point out that even in the interests of the compulsory introduction of Hindi, if I may say so, Sir, this repressive policy is cutting the ground under the feet of the compulsory introduction of Hindi. In the interests of the policy and the principle which is at the bottom of the present day Government, Sir, I submit, this repressive policy must be given up. If I may say so, the country has been agitated not by the anti-Hindi agitation, but it has been agitated most by this repressive policy, by the clapping in jails of hundreds of innocent youths in the name of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. My hon. Friend called this as no repression. This nomenclature is not given by me or my hon. Friend, but one given by the Congress Party to which the Government of the day has the honour to belong. Therefore, Sir, if I call this Criminal Law Amendment Act as a piece of repressive legislation, I am only following the lead given by my Hon. friends on the other side. (Interruption.) I said, I am giving the name which the Congress Party gave; I am not calling it by any new names whatsoever.

"So far as this policy of repression is concerned, Sir, it has been already stated by my friend who came before me that it is really repressive, because, innocent youths who are doing merely Satyagraha are (An hon. Member: 'Satyagraha or Duragraha?') I am not here to answer my hon. Friend. I shall go on."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member may be allowed to go on without interruption."

KHAN BAHADUR P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB BAHADUR:—"Innocent youths are clapped in jails in the name of this law for six months' rigorous imprisonment and even magistrates are making fun at them by saying that people who come to perform Satyagraha must be prepared to undergo every suffering. This is exactly the very thing which the Congress condemned in unmistakable terms when they were prosecuted by the previous Government. There is not one occasion which they missed when they did not condemn this repressive policy of the previous Government. I cannot refrain from saying 'What a fall was there my countrymen!' . . . (Loud cheers and laughter.) The Congress, the very Congress organization condemned this law as the most repressive and called it a Satanic piece of legislation passed under the direct orders of the Viceroy even without going through the formality of the Legislature; the very same Satanic law is being used as a weapon to safeguard the person of no less a person than the Hon. the Premier of this Presidency of Madras. I wonder what a pass the Government has come to. (Interruption.) Surely, Sir, interruptions are being made I do not know for what purpose. What was I doing, I am being asked I was never using these repressive laws during the very short time that I was in charge of Government. (Laughter.) Surely, there was no need for it and even if there was an agitation, if there was Satyagraha, if there was anything worse than that, I would never have resorted to this Satanic pece of so-called legislation." (Interruption.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think the House must keep perfectly silent."

KHAN BAHADUR P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB BAHADUR:—"Coming to the question regarding this repressive policy, I have pointed out that the punishments given are unduly severe and really unthinkable, I would call them. They bear absolutely no proportion to the offence that is alleged against them.

"Lastly, Sir, I have to point out one very important matter in this connexion, namely, whether legally this section 7 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act is applicable to the case of people performing Satyagraha before the house of the Hon. the Premier; because that section reads that 'no person who loiters about the house, etc., of a Government officer'. I submit, Sir, it is my own humble view, and I think, it is correct, that the Hon. the Premier and the other Ministers are not officers of Government; they are Government themselves. Even that Satanic Government which promulgated this piece of legislation, never thought it necessary to extend the provisions of this Satanic Legislation to the Members of the Government themselves. They thought that they could save themselves. But now, Sir, we see the miserable plight of the Hon. the Premier trying to guard his house under section 7 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. (Some hon. Members: 'Ho!')

18th August 1938] [Mr. P. Khalif-ul-lah]

"My hon. Friend, Mr. Palat, has already referred to a statement of Mahatma Gandhi to the effect that there can be no compulsion in any scheme of Ahimsa. The Congress stands for Ahimsa. The Congress Government of Madras stands for Ahimsa and where is the place for compulsion. Where is the scope for compulsion in this regime of Ahimsa, I ask Sir. If only, Sir, my hon. Friend said that every Muslim ought to welcome this compulsory introduction of Hindi or Hindustani or whatever it may be called, I certainly shall welcome the Hon. Premier to introduce compulsory Urdu in every Muslim school in the province. I ask him here and in this House, if he is prepared to introduce compulsory Urdu as it obtains to-day in all the Muslim schools in this Presidency. If it is so, Sir, I welcome warmly the measure. Sir, I refuse to be compelled to read a language, the so-called Hindustani, that is sought to be introduced in the schools. The Mussalman, Sir, sets a very great value upon his culture, not merely upon his language. Now take the text book that is specified for these schools. Not one Muslim boy, not one Muslim child can start education unless it be in the name of Allah. Is that word printed in that book; how dare you compel a Muslim to take this book and start his education when this word does not find a place in the book which is known as compulsory Hindi or Hindustani text book. (Interruption.) I advise very sincerely and earnestly my Muslim brethren not to take up such a book at all. I think, Sir, I can claim that the entire Muslim population stands by me (hon. Members: 'No.') as is clearly shown by the fact that I made a challenge even several months ago, that on this question alone I am willing to fight any hon. Member sitting in this House in his own constituency or any hon. Muslim Member in his own Muslim constituency. I throw out the same challenge in this House (interruption) that if any hon. Member is prepared to resign his seat, I am prepared to resign mine and challenge him to stand in his own constituency." (Interruption.)

Mr. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member may resign, but he cannot call upon other hon. Members to resign."

Khan Bahadur P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:— 7-45 p.m.
"It is perfectly legitimate on my part to make that challenge. I can safely say that I can beat my hon. Friend by a majority of 99 per cent, if not 100 per cent. (Cries of 'Oh!') There is no use of crying Oh! I have thrown out a challenge. If you are strong and if you are convinced that the people will support you, it is up to you to accept that challenge, resign your seat, and I shall resign my seat this moment, go to your constituency and stand for election on this very issue, and defeat you. I feel confident that the country stands by me. It is only in this view that I am opposed to the compulsory introduction of Hindi in schools. My hon. Friend has completely lost sight of that fact altogether. It is

[Mr. P. Khalif-ul-lah] [18th August 1938

not compulsory introduction of Urdu in Muslim schools, or compulsory introduction of Hindustani either in Urdu characters or Nagari characters. That is a different matter. These two things are different. If my hon. Friend does not understand it, I am really sorry for him. (Laughter.) It is true that he wanted to hint that twelve lakhs of Mappillas in Malabar, sixteen lakhs of Rowthers in Tamil Nadu and several lakhs in Andhra desa do not know Urdu. I may at once say that I am a Rowther myself; my mother-tongue is Tamil and not Urdu. I am not ashamed of it; I am proud of it. (Rao Bahadur Sir A. T. Pannir Selvam: one does not know Urdu, that one does not wish to know Urdu? if my mother-tongue is Tamil. And does it follow, simply because one does not know Urdu, that one does not wish to know Urdu? And this same thing applies to the twelve lakhs of Mappillas in Malabar, the sixteen lakhs of Rowthers in Tamil Nadu and the several lakhs in Andhra desa. I challenge my hon. Friend representing South Arcot Muhammadan Rural constituency, whether he has gone to that place and ascertained the views of the Rowthers about this subject. I challenge him, is he bold enough to go to South Arcot and show his head before his constituency on this issue?"

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"On a point of personal explanation, Sir, there is a limit for challenging. (Laughter.) I have addressed meetings; I have gone round the whole place, and I understand every Muslim is willing to learn the language of India in the Urdu script, if only opportunity is offered."

Khan Bahadur P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, this is the first time I hear my friend saying that he has taken the views of his constituency. I have been reading the newspapers regularly and I have not seen anything in the papers about it at all. My only inference on his not accepting the challenge is that he has lost the confidence of his constituency, and therefore he dare not resign his seat and seek re-election on this issue. I am prepared to resign even to-morrow; I do not want to wait a single moment.

"Coming to Criminal Law Amendment Act, the Congress Government, wherever it may function whether in the North-West Frontier Province or in the Madras Province, I thought, would pursue the same policy. I see the same law has been repealed by the Congress Ministry in the North-West Frontier province, and I have seen Dr. Khare telling on more than one occasion that he has repealed this repressive and oppressive piece of legislation. And still, Sir, what do we see in Madras, in our province? Not only that piece of legislation is not repealed, but is being resorted to for defending, as I said before, the Hon. Premier himself from the loiterers in front of his house on the road. Not only that; the use of this Satanic legislation is being defended on the floor of this

18th August 1938] [Mr. P. Khalif-ul-lah]

House! My own wonder is how he expects his defence of the use of this law will carry any conviction to the masses, before whom thousands of times the Hon. Premier has said and reiterated that the repeal of this repressive legislation will be the first business of the Ministry, should the Congress Party take charge of the affairs of Government? It is now nearly fourteen or fifteen months since the Congress Party assumed office; and so far, they have done nothing to repeal that Act. They have been waiting; and not only that, they have taken stock of it and have been using it against the very Satyagrahis, against whom, they declared once that this should not be used.

" Sir, since you have ruled that it is irrelevant to speak on Hindi or Urdu or Hindustani, I desist from speaking on that. I say the policy of repression is highly reprehensible, and the earlier that policy is given up, the better for the fair name of Congress, to which Hon. Ministers belong and the hon. Members of the Government Party belong."

* THE HON. MR. YAKUB HASAN:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not intend to intervene in this debate; but now it has taken such a turn that if I keep quiet, my silence is likely to be misunderstood. Therefore, Sir, I wish to say very few words on this subject. Sir, the question before this House in the form of this resolution, which of all the people, the Leader of the Muslim League has chosen to bring forward, and that in this House, is to condemn the alleged repression of the Congress Government. Sir, one would have thought that that resolution would have been discussed on its own merits. The speakers who spoke on this resolution, I thought, would try to expose us, would try to show us that we have been doing something, which as Congress members we ought not to have done. I was eager to hear what they had to say in the matter. Everyone of us cannot see his own fault. For that, we must turn to our opponents to tell us what our faults are we must turn to them to learn our faults, acknowledge our mistakes, if any, convince ourselves whether we are pursuing a right or wrong course, and if found to be wrong, not persist in it thereafter. The Hon. Premier will in his reply deal with this aspect of the question, and deal with it very ably, Sir, and therefore I do not wish to say anything about that.

" Sir, it must be remembered that our fight before the first of April 1937 was against the British Government; it was a fight against a foreign Government; it was a fight of nationalists against a foreign Government; and in that fight we used all that was available to fight the foreign Government and to attain our object of driving it away from this country. The foreign Government brought forward laws, which we called repressive, because they wanted to repress us from carrying on our agitation against

the foreign Government. The same laws cannot be called repressive, if they are used by a popular Government against people who are out to prevent that popular Government from carrying on a legitimate act of spreading Hindustani. Whether a law is repressive or not has to be judged only from the purpose it is used for. When the foreign Government tries to repress the people of a country, and enacts laws to repress them, those laws are called repressive; but when that law is used against a people who are out to annoy the head of the Government, whose sole object is nothing but to annoy him, to make his work at home impossible when he sits at in his house and tries to carry on work there, when those people bawl out, call names and use abusive language against him, you cannot call it repressive. Give me, Sir, some law to prevent that kind of annoyance and nuisance. We find no such law at present in the statute book; and you shall see before long that we will bring such a law; and till we bring that law—till then—we are entitled to use every law that is available in the statute book to prevent such nuisance. (Mr. Basheer Ahmed: 'Hear, hear.') Sir, I do not wish to go into the details of the subject. All I wish to say is that there are a number of people at present who are not very happy on the fact that the Congress Party has come into power. I can understand those people who were a party; or rather I should say I I can understand some members of the party who were in power in the dyarchy, who had some power under British supervision, and had a subordinate position in the British Government of the Madras province; if that party, or some leading members of that party did something in order to make Congress Government unpopular, of course it would be a legitimate thing.

"Unfortunately among Mussalmans the anti-Congress menta-
8 p.m. lity has spread of late with the result that Mussalmans are now mostly condemning everything that the Congress wishes to do for them. Even when the Congress does some good to them, they will have some suspicion about it, and they say that there must be something behind it, and that the Congress is doing it with some ulterior motive. That is the kind of mentality that has unfortunately developed among Mussalmans. I say to the Muslim League members and other Muslim members who do not see eye to eye with the Congress Mussalmans that they may be within their rights to carry on their agitation against the Congress and even against the Congress Government, but I would plead at the same time that they should not lose their sense of proportion and that they should not lose their balance—if I may be excused to say so.

"Now the question is distinct. We the Mussalmans of Madras have been working for the last 40 years to make Hindustani the language of all the Mussalmans of the Madras Presidency. In

1901 when the All India Muslim Educational Conference was held here, in Madras, under the guidance of Nawab Mohsinul Mulk who was a great supporter of Hindustani . . ."

KHAN BAHADUR P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB BAHADUR:—" It was Urdu, not Hindustani."

THE HON. MR. YAKUB HASAN:—" Yes, it was Hindustani."

KHAN BAHADUR P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB BAHADUR:—" Not Hindustani but Urdu."

THE HON. MR. YAKUB HASAN:—" Yes, Hindustani."

KHAN BAHADUR P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB BAHADUR:—" Not Hindustani."

THE HON. MR. YAKUB HASAN:—" Hindustani language, Hindustani culture. So, Sir, I was going to say that one of the resolutions that were passed at the Conference was that Hindustani should be taught throughout the Presidency. Since that time, we have been working for that end. But unfortunately we made very little headway because the Mussalmans, on account of their laziness, talked much about Urdu but did nothing to spread it. We have been urging upon the Government that if there were twenty Muslim boys in a school, whether their mother tongue was Hindustani or not, there should be a teacher in that school to teach Urdu to those boys. That resolution was also put forward by the Committee which was appointed by the Government to look into the question of Muslim education. That Committee made several other recommendations and some of them were accepted by the Government. One of the recommendations of the Committee was that facilities should be given to Muslims throughout Malabar, Tamil Nad, Andhra Desa and everywhere, to learn Hindustani. However we are a small minority community, and the then Government, I mean the past Government which was British in character, said 'Why should we spend so much money on Urdu education? Why should we make special provision for giving Urdu education to Muslim boys? Why can't they learn Tamil, inasmuch as most of them are Tamilians? Why should they learn Hindustani, and why should district boards and municipalities be asked to have teachers for this purpose?' In this way there was a resistance to the Muslim proposal. We were in a minority, and notwithstanding our agitation, we did not succeed in it. Still we, Mussalman and Muslim National Organizations, who wanted for the last 40 years that Hindustani should become the language of all the Muslims throughout India, that it should be the language of the Muslims in Bengal, in Gujarat, in Maharashtra and elsewhere, have been doing what we could in our own way, and we have succeeded to

a very great extent. If to-day in this Southern India Hindustani is being spoken far and wide, it is because of our efforts. The Conference of 1901 adopted a resolution to the effect that Hindustani should be included among the languages that were recognized as being essential to a Government servant. Government servants were required to know two languages, and in that list of languages for Government servants, Hindustani was included, all because of our efforts. We did not give up our original ambition that Hindustani should be the language for the whole of India, but our progress in this direction was limited, because the majority community, the Hindus, were indifferent and would not learn that language. But now, thanks to the efforts of the Hindi Prachar Sabah, thousands and thousands of people are taking diplomas every year in that language. More and more people are taking to the study of that language, and now there are many Hindus who are very proficient in that language. Such being the case, is it not now the time for the Mussalmans who had all along wished that Hindustani should become the language of India, to support and welcome a measure that seeks to bring about this end? It is easy for them now to do, and I am sure all Mussalmans throughout the Presidency welcome the proposal. Messrs. Abdul Hameed Khan and Ahmed Badsha have in their speeches dragged in irrelevant things. They have not stopped with discussing about repression, but they have brought in Hindustani and Urdu and spoke vehemently about them unnecessarily, and that is the reason why it necessitated Mr. Basheer Ahmed to say something about it. I am also forced to speak on this matter.

"Sir, Mr. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib said that if Government were to bring in a measure to make the learning of Urdu compulsory in all Muslim schools, he would welcome it. There he is caught! (Laughter.) If the Government make the study of Urdu compulsory in all Muslim schools, Mr. Khalif-ul-lah will welcome it! Why does he not welcome it, Sir, when the same language is made compulsory for Hindus also?"

(Interruption by Mr. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib, Mr. Laljan and Rao Bahadur Sir Pannir Selvam.)

Hon. MEMBERS:—"Order, order."

Khan Bahadur P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"On a point of personal explanation. My hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed said that Mussalmans cannot have any objection and that they ought to welcome this proposal for compulsory Hindi or Hindustani. In reply to that I said that so far as Mussalmans are concerned, if the Hindi or Hindustani that is now sought to be introduced in schools is such as was being taught for ages past, we would all welcome it. Surely, the insinuation made by my Hon. Friend . . ."

18th August 1938]

* Mr. SPEAKER :—" I think this is not a personal explanation. It is an endless speech which the hon. Member is not entitled to carry on."

The Hon. Mr. YAKUB HASAN :—" Sir Pannir Selvam said that Hindustani is not the language of the Hindus, and he thinks, Hindus are justified in opposing it. But what I said was that if Mr. Kalif-ul-lah would welcome its being taught to Muslims compulsorily, he should also welcome the same being taught to Hindus also. With regard to Hindus of Tamil Nad, the case is somewhat different. They say that this is not their language, and the Tamilians take objection to it, on the ground that it will harm their language. I can understand that, and the question can be discussed on its own merits. I have no quarrel with them. But I have got a quarrel with that Mussalman, whether he is a Tamil Mussalman or whether he is an Andhra Mussalman or a Malayalee Mussalman or even a Karnataka Mussalman, who says that he wants that his children should learn Hindustani and at the same time wants to deny that privilege to his Hindu brethren. It is an admitted fact—and even Mr. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib, the arch-agitator in this case, admits that he will welcome it if all the Muslim children are made to learn Hindustani—that Mussalmans will welcome the proposal whereby all Muslim boys will be compelled to learn Hindustani. When once that is admitted, why do you not welcome a proposal whereby all boys, including Hindus, will be enabled to learn Hindustani. In fact the Mussalmans ought to welcome such a proposal, and I know that it has been welcomed for it is the triumph of the cause which Mussalmans were upholding so long.

" Now as regards the books and other things, we have taken the precaution to see that only pure Hindustani is taught. So, it does not matter in what script it is taught, whether in Nagari script or in the Urdu script. It makes no difference. Teachers are required to know both the scripts. There would have been valid ground for objection if Government had insisted that Muslim boys should learn Hindustani in Nagari script only. Had such been the case, the Mussalmans would have been justified in agitating against Hindustani or even carrying on satyagraha against it. if they like. In that case I would have certainly resigned my seat in the Cabinet and joined them." (Applause.)

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. T. PANNIR SELVAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not propose to deal with the propriety of the arbitrary order of the Government in the matter of compulsory introduction of Hindi in the schools; nor do I propose to deal with the question of agitation against this order of the Government; nor do I intend to question the extravagant assertion made by some Members of the Government that this agitation is only the work of a few disgruntled persons; nor do I wish to say anything about the allegation made on behalf of the members of the Government

that this agitation was started by their political opponents; nor am I worried with the Government's seeking to minimize the volume of opinion in the country regarding this question. If they are not aware of the volume of opinion that is gathering against them, or if they will be willingly blind to that, I am not at all concerned with that. In fact as a political opponent, I would welcome such an attitude on their part.

" If I raise to speak on this occasion, it is only because I find that there has been a considerable attempt on the part of the Hon. Minister for Public Works, and Mr. Basheer Ahmed to confound the issue. The question at issue now is not one of Muslim versus non-Muslim. Nor is it a question of Hindi against Hindustani or Urdu. The agitation is mainly that of the Tamilians who feel that they are being forced to learn—whether it is a Muslim language or a Hindu language or whether you take it in a middle way, namely Hindustani—a foreign language. To Tamilians it is a language which is foreign in script, in words, in culture and in tradition. It is a language with which we have absolutely nothing to do. Language as you know has much to do with civilization and culture, and the Tamilians believe that by the introduction of this foreign language their own language, their own civilization and their own culture will be seriously affected. This is the issue that has to be kept now in our view. It is that issue that has been kept in front."

THE HON. MR. YAKUB HASAN :—" This is going to be in a Swaraj of Tamilians; you will be happy to live in it."

8·15 p.m. RAO BAHADUR SIR A. T. PANNIR SELVAM :—" Quite so, when I think of Swaraj. I look forward to a Government of the Tamilians by the Tamils for the Tamils. I am not thinking of the Dravidian civilization being sacrificed for the Aryan civilization. I do not wish for the subordination of Dravidian culture to any other culture. If you are going to drive out the British. drive them out. But then it should be only for a real Swaraj for our own people. But this is just a diversion caused by an interjection of the Hon. Minister for Public Works.

" My main object is to congratulate the Government on the consistency with which they have been carrying on the administration ever since they took up office, i.e., consistency in completely throwing overboard every one of the election pledges. One of the main items of the election pledges was the separation of the judiciary and the executive. This very Criminal Law Amendment Act as was pointed out by previous speakers was to be fought against and removed from the Statute book. That was one of the election pledges. Then again you were going to relieve the burden on agriculturists by the reduction of land revenue. There has been no relaxation in their burden. But a further burden

18th August 1938] [Sir A. T. Pannir Selvam]

in some form or other is imposed on them. Then, as for the separation of the judiciary from the executive, verily because the country is being governed by the elected representatives of the people, the necessity for the separation has evaporated. So at least says our Premier. As regards the Criminal Law Amendment Act much has been said against it, that law was an anathema, that law was an Act of the bureaucratic Government. But you say, ' we people are here to put you down,' or in the language used by the Minister for Public Works ' to crush you down with this Act.' Because again you are the representatives of the people, all that was evil before has now become good, because they are to be used by you.

" Again, on the very question of Hindustani or Hindi where are the election pledges? Does this find a place in your programme? You say: ' We have been elected by the people, we are the representatives of the people; we are the custodians of the lives and privileges of the people, and what we do is right; we have come into power and we think it is right.'

" There were dictators before in our country and they were ruling for the benefit of the people under them. But you, with this very odious Act, want to put down the Dravidian language and substitute it by Aryan culture. By introducing the Hindustani language you are attempting to impose a foreign language, foreign in culture, foreign in tradition. Again you are surprised that we should protest against Hindi when we have been submitting meekly to the study of English. I can only say that for the original introduction of English, I was not responsible. It was introduced 150 years ago, when the people were helpless. It was a foreign language. But to-day it has become one with us, and come to stay with us. If there is to be a choice between Hindi and English I should welcome English, because it is better than Hindi as a language of the public. But if you say that Hindi must be the language, the Andhras may ask why not Telugu. The Andhras have been agitating for a separate province. So they may press for it. Inevitably there will be a clash between Tamil and Hindi in our own province. Why should any Government have any common language, which must be imposed on all? Why should we anticipate what our future generations will want? Why should my friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed threaten us with the rule of the Tamil Nadu being the rule of Hindi-speaking people? Why should we anticipate these conflicts? Is it not calculated to injure the Dravidian culture which has been fighting for centuries against the domination of any foreign culture? This conflict has been going on for ages between Dravidian culture and Aryan culture. Take our Ramayana. Is it not merely symbolical of the clash of these cultures? Do you want to perpetuate it again? You want to make this

a province to be ruled over by Aryan culture in which the people of the country are going to have no voice, no power. The real reason for the agitation is because we want to fight against this concealed danger. This agitation is not artificially brought about. It is not the work of merely a few disgruntled persons, nor even that of your political opponents. Your Education Minister has himself openly admitted the genuineness of the feeling of the people on this question. If you are going to ignore it, do so by all means. Have resort to the Criminal Law Amendment Act, adopt repressive measures, and try and stifle public opinion. Do all this, and do more, to keep yourself floating; but the day is not far off when you will also rue it."

* THE HON. MR. T. PRAKASAM:—"Sir, this debate has become rather very hot. We have been anxious on this side to win the sympathy and support of the Opposition in this House, not only in this House but outside this House as well. But what do we find? When discussing the resolution Mr. Khalif-ul-lah was challenging and Sir Pannir Selvam was thumping his table, and the foundations of the building were shaking as it were. I was reminded, Sir, of what I witnessed so long ago in the German Parliament, Reichstag. As I was sitting in the upper gallery I saw two gentlemen getting up and challenging each other for a duel and walking out of the House. I did not have the opportunity of seeing the duel and seeing the result of it.

8-30 p.m. "Why this heat? Why this excitement, I am not able to understand. Members of the Opposition as well as Members on this side have got certain privileges. They have got the privilege of free speech. The privilege of free criticism is given to everyone here. They are free to use that privilege and criticise us and we are here to receive those criticisms and examine them to see whether there is anything that could be accepted by us with a view to correct our position. But there is a limit to the use of this privilege. The privilege should not be abused in a manner to let the public believe that the attack is not a genuine attack against a certain measure, but that it is an attack made for a different purpose altogether. I am glad, and I congratulate Sir Pannir Selvam, a Minister at one time, a gentleman who had been educated in a foreign country and has been practising the legal profession as a barrister, for his talk about the Tamil language and for his desire to have the country for the Tamilians and none else. As I was listening to his speech I was wondering whether it is the same Sir Pannir Selvam who had his education in England, who has been practising here and who held high offices till now, who was talking. Should he forget the constitution of this country? Should he forget the condition of his people? Should he forget that the Government to-day or to-morrow will not be the Government of the Tamils only for the

18th August 1938] [Mr. T. Prakasam]

Tamil province, the Andhras only for the Andhra province and the Malabar people only for the Malabar province? He should know, as a gentleman who held so many offices that there is a Central Government, that there is Federation coming. Federation is coming upon him and upon his children. He will see before long that the Federal Government will come into operation and, when members are sent from this province to the Centre, he will probably be one and a Minister even and, at that time, his own children will not care for him or for his advice if that is going to be against the learning of Hindi or Hindustani."

RAO BAHADUR SIR A. T. PANNIR SELVAM:—"A word of personal explanation, Sir. I am not against the learning of Hindi or Hindustani or Urdu; but I am against compulsion being applied on any boy for learning a language against his will. There is a fundamental difference between that and what the Hon. Minister has been attributing to me."

THE HON. MR. T. PRAKASAM:—"There is no good confusing issues by attempting to offer explanations in the middle of my speech. I have not digressed from the point raised by the hon. Member. He said about the Tamils only governing the Tamil province forgetting everything else in India. That is why I had to point out to the hon. Member that there is another Government to which he himself would go and where he or his sons would be Ministers. There would be no English language in which they can address the Chamber. And he is against the learning of Hindustani which is spoken by about 20 crores of people in India as stated by the Hon. Muhammad Pasha Saheb, and which will be the language of the Federal Assembly at no distant date. Those who carry on this agitation against Hindustani or Urdu, whatever you may call it, are committing a sin against their children. I said that elsewhere and I repeat it to-day. Educating one's children is the primary duty of the parents. The parents will not be always permitted to prescribe the language that should be taught to their children. Next to them, or even before them, the State would come in in this matter. It is for the State to prescribe the language in which the children should be educated. (Sir A. T. Pannir Selvam: 'Question.') The hon. Member says: 'Question.' He can never question a fundamental doctrine applicable to the whole universe. (Loud laughter.) A doctrine of that kind can never be questioned so lightly. The State has taken up in this province this subject and has prescribed Hindustani as a compulsory subject for the children. Has this been sprung upon this country for the first time? The name 'Hindustani' might have been used on account of the objections taken with a view to satisfy those friends and to get Sir Pannir Selvam's support also. The subject of Hindi has been before this country ever since the political movement was

started by that single man who has been quoted often by everybody. My Hon. Colleague, Mr. Yakub Hasan, says that I might use the name 'Hindustani' only and not 'Hindi.' I may in this connexion tell my Hon. Colleague and this House, Sir, that during a recent research work I was doing in another connexion, I came upon this word 'Hindi' in a book called 'Ain-i-Akbari' written in the days of Emperor Akbar about the revenue system prevailing in those days. And that system, Sir, has become the basis of the present revenue system of the Government to-day. I cannot go beyond that and I do not wish to enter into any controversy over that matter. I shall use the word 'Hindustani' only as advised by my Hon. Colleague. Sir, some 20 years ago when Gandiji started this movement, he did not dream of these elections and he never knew that the Provincial Governments would come into the hands of Congressmen. He started it with a vision and it has been before the public for 20 years. Sir Pannir Selvam speaks of the Tamil country for the Tamilians alone. Has he ever tried to know the extent to which Hindi has already spread in the Tamil districts? Has he tried to know to what extent little boys and girls and even elders have learnt Hindi during the last 20 years? Ignoring these things he should not attempt to clutch at anything that comes in his way and turn it against his political opponents. But I must congratulate Sir Pannir Selvam in that he has not concealed his mind. He said that, as a political opponent, he would take advantage of anything that comes in his way. In our anxiety to make friends with him and to take him with us, may I be permitted to tell him, Sir, that he should not adopt the policy of catching hold of anything that comes in the way and with it attack his political opponents? Anyhow, Sir, that is not a policy that should be adopted in a matter connected with education.

"Now, what is it that they have made out of this Hindi question? Sir, it is said that it was a wrong move to have made this compulsory. Sir Pannir Selvam himself and almost all the members of this House who have studied in schools have had to go through a compulsory course of English language. Can any one come forward and say that English was the language of those who were ruling us before the British came into this country? And yet, Sir, that language has been accepted by all of us and it has been forced on our children also. Did any one then say that the English language should not be forced on him? I am glad, Sir, that some of the hon. Members who were speaking with some authority have stated the previous history of Hindi. I am one of those who have the privilege to stand up before this House and say that 50 years ago I was learning Urdu in some little place here in the north of Madras. As the previous rulers were Muslims, their language was still there. It was taught in schools and I

18th August 1938] [Mr. T. Prakasam]

learnt Urdu in a school more than 50 years ago. That being the case, what can be the justification on the part of hon. Members of the Muslim community for their opposition to this question and for the spirit in which they have been opposing it? There is absolutely no justification. We are anxious to be with you, to work with you and carry on the administration with your help. Is this the way in which you should treat this Government because it is coming forward, because it is pressing forward to make friends with you, even with you repeatedly? That is not the spirit in which you should view it. You have joined issue on a wrong point altogether. We are here to face any criticism of yours; we are here to meet your challenge when it comes legitimately. Why do you come on a wrong issue and put yourselves in a hole like this? (Loud applause.)

" Sir, one hon. Member had had the courage to say here 'Look at the pitiable and miserable condition of the Prime Minister.' He should not have said that light-heartedly. He is one who occupied the position of a Minister for some little time before we came into office. He should have thought awhile before he used that expression. What is there in the condition of the Hon. the Prime Minister to-day which he has thought fit to call miserable? If the Prime Minister is in a miserable condition, everyone of the Ministers is in the same miserable condition; and not only the Ministers, but every one sitting on this side or that is in the same miserable condition. (Cheers.) We are not in a miserable condition. People should not come here and get up and make speeches in that way forgetting their responsibility to the outside world and saying that the Government are committing a crime in calling upon the young men of this country to learn a language which would help them in forming the Central Government and running the administration there. Is there anything of a crime in this? Can you not think awhile and judge for yourself? Supposing we are your opponents, is it right that you should get up and take advantage of a procession with black flags decrying the compulsory introduction of Hindustani? You are expected to exercise your judgment, examine the whole position and see whether your political opponents sitting here are really committing any crime. If they are committing any crime, certainly you are entitled to challenge them. (Rao Bahadur Sir A. T. Pannir Selvam: 'We are charging you. You are committing a crime.') Sir Pannir Selvam says so. I have told him and those who think with him that they are committing a sin against themselves and their children. (Loud cheers.) When you deny to your children the benefit of the education that the State offers and has a right to offer, you are committing a crime of the worst kind and worse even than that is the crime which those misguided men are committing to-day by

standing in front of the Hon. the Premier's house and making a nuisance of themselves (applause) using filthy language against him.

8.45 p.m. "Now let us examine what is going on in front of the Premier's house. I am a man who has travelled much in the outside world. I am a man who came into this movement at an advanced stage and age also. What is it that is going on in front of the Premier's house? Any dispassionate gentleman who takes an impartial view, if he goes and sits in front of the Premier's house for a few minutes, would see for himself the hell of noise made and foul and filthy language used by the boys (Cries of 'Shame, shame'). And who are there in the house? Is it the Prime Minister? The Prime Minister goes on tour from one end of the Presidency to the other. These people go and sit in front of the Premier's house, day in and day out, and they go on using foul language and making hell of noise when only ladies and children are in the house. (An hon. Member: 'No, it is not so.') It is worse than a crime. I say it is a crime of the worst character. (Interruption by Rao Bahadur Sir A. T. Pannir Selvam.) I have not yielded yet, Sir. Do not make statements which are not supported by evidence. I appeal to Sir Pannir Selvam and his friend not to be carried away by excitement. This is not a matter for excitement. This is a simple proposition, a resolution on which we should not have to talk such things and you will be free in your turn to make speeches."

An hon. MEMBER:—"We are not allowed."

The Hon. Mr. T. PRAKASAM:—"No, no. You are allowed. You are only anxious to interrupt, that is all. I want to tell you one fact. Mr. Appadurai Pillai is a steady politician, who will not always speak his own opinions. (Laughter.) (Sir Pannir Selvam interrupted and suggested that Mr. Pillai was attacked.) He would try to fortify what he would like to express by quoting authorities. I don't mean anything else. You need not be in a hurry to set him up. (Laughter and applause.) Mr. Appadurai Pillai referred to Pandit Kunzru's speech and another speech and another speech. Speeches are made by Pandit Kunzru and others, but they have not witnessed what is going on in front of the Premier's house. From the speeches made by the Opposition members, it would appear to the outside world that there was really some question of civil liberty being interfered with. There is not any question of civil liberty here, Sir, allow me to tell all the hon. Members of the House, no civil liberty is being interfered with here. If there should be any provision under which these people could be removed or dealt with, we would have done so. Somebody said there was a provision in the Nuisance Act; why could they not be removed under it. But there is no provision in the Acts, so far as we have been advised and so far as

18th August 1938] [Mr. T. Prakasam]

we have known under which this sort of thing, the new crime that has been now created could be removed or could be dealt with. That was the real situation that has arisen and what is to be done under those circumstances? We have no objection to an agitation of this sort with the marching of processions with black flags, from Cape Comorin to Madras and to the northern parts of the Presidency. But what is done in front of the Premier's house is not that. Should they sit down and see all these things being done? It was a nuisance for which there was no provision in the law. They sit in front of the Prime Minister's house and make it intolerable for the inmates of the house to live there. I will take the House into my confidence and tell the House a small incident. I advised the Prime Minister: 'This nuisance has become so serious. Can we not do something? We are the Government. Can we not do something by appointing our officers to prevent these people from coming in front of the Premier's house altogether?' I will tell you what answer the Premier gave. He did not give me an answer at once. It looked as if he was inclined to agree with me. But when I asked him after a day or two, whether he had given effect to it, he said: 'How can I give effect to it? If there is a nuisance in front of my house, can I remove it to the front of somebody else's house, and make them suffer? Let them be only here. I do not want to put a policeman there and a policeman here and remove them to make trouble in front of other people's houses.' That is the sort of Prime Minister you have got. He was characterized as a dictator (Hear, hear) on the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. We do not deny we attacked it; we do not deny that we suffered under it but our sufferings were under altogether a different set of conditions. Never was such a crime committed in front of the house of the head of the Government in the manner in which it has been done. The Criminal Law Amendment Act would not be on the statute book for a long time. We will take it away when we get from this House some other law which would prevent crimes of this character that have been newly invented with a view to embarass the Government. Do not believe that this Government would run away by this sort of obstruction and by this sort of support given in an ill-advised manner. We will face it. The Government will face it. There is no difficulty about it. I may tell you what happened in Ireland and what happened here. What happened in Ireland may happen in India, under the same circumstances, only without bloodshed. Cosgrave was in office; De Valera was in opposition. Cosgrave framed laws with a view to suppress De Valera and his followers. The Act provided that there need not be direct evidence or even circumstantial evidence. If there was suspicion, they could be booked and they could be sentenced, even to capital punishment. Another thing I forgot to tell you. There was to be no appeal from that sentence. De Valera survived. (Rao Bahadur Sir A. T. Pannir Selvam: 'So will we.')

Welcome, welcome to take this office in the legitimate course. Do not lend yourselves to support such things. (Hear, hear.) What happened? Shortly after this Act was attempted to be applied against De Valera, De Valera came into office. (Rao Bahadur Sir A. T. Pannir Selvam: 'Hear, hear.') He must wait a little longer and see. De Valera had the whole administration of the country in his hands and had full work to do. But Cosgrave started giving trouble. Cosgrave thought that because De Valera opposed the law which he had framed, he would not apply it against him. He was mistaken. De Valera had no time to think about anything. He applied against Cosgrave and his followers the laws he had framed. Allow me to tell the Members of this House, during the past one year, this Government has been endeavouring to do its best, with the support of you all, with your sympathy and support. You must wait for your opportunity to defeat this Government on issues which are legitimate and proper. (An hon. Member interrupted.) Sir Pannir Selvam admitted that he would take anything that came his way as a political opponent. Pray, don't do that. Here we have had hardly time to get through the programme that we chalked out during one year. Wonderfully in an unexpected way some gentleman who had not been satisfied with himself and with the whole world itself starts a movement and then leads it to the front of the Premier's house to make a hell of noise, to-morrow to my house and then to the house of every one who has given us the vote and put this Gvernment in office. Will that be tolerated? You will find, Sir, that it is not out of love for this Criminal Law Amendment Act that it has been applied. It has been applied under strange circumstances, and you will find, that this is not the Government that tries to carry on by a repressive policy. There is no repression here at all. On the other hand, the tolerance was too much and it was misunderstood. The Prime Minister suspended arrests for some time. What happened? Some gentleman, Pandit Kunzru came and talked and some other gentleman and some other gentleman talked. They thought they had gathered strength on account of Pandit Kunzru's speech. Then what happened? Because arrests had been suspended for some days, a larger force came in and began to make a hell of trouble and distribute all sorts of literature in front of the Premier's house. I am telling all this to this hon. House with a view to impress upon their minds that there was no desire on the part of the Government with regard to the enforcement of repression in putting down this agitation. None could have shown greater tolerance than the Prime Minister and his Government in regard to this matter. The Act was applied only because there was no sufficient interval to frame another measure, another piece of legislation. We are loath to use it. We do not like the Criminal Law Amendment Act ourselves. But if you want to do such acts with a view to find anything as a weapon to attack this Government, we have to defend ourselves and

18th August 1938] [Mr. T. Prakasam]

we have defended ourselves. Never go under the impression, no one hon. Member should go under the impression that any intolerance has been shown in regard to this matter. Let the movement thrive; let it gather strength, if it can. If they can persuade the nation, the country, that what has been done by the Government is wrong, well then, the Government will have to pay for it. If you are having a perfectly legitimate and constitutional movement, I will even go the length of allowing these misguided young men to adopt even unconstitutional methods. But let it be through non-violence which was adopted by those who fought for the freedom of the country. With these words, I sit down."

* KUMARARAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :— 9 p.m.
"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the discussion on this resolution has taken a varied course. The resolution that has been moved and the resolution given notice of by a Member of our party, Diwan Bahadur Appadurai Pillai, are both fairly similar in character and relate to the repressive measures of the Government. The discussion that has followed has been to a very large extent on the question of the compulsory introduction of Hindi. At one stage during the debate there was a doubt whether it was proper to discuss more elaborately the question of the introduction of Hindi and whether it was not proper to confine the discussion to the measures adopted by the Government to put down the agitation against Hindi. But inasmuch as discussion has been allowed on both the points I hope I will be permitted to speak on both the points. I assure you, Sir, I will not take up the time of the House as it is already 9 o'clock and there must be some time for the Government to reply after I have finished.

" Sir, the object of the resolution is to bring to the notice of the House the very strong feeling in the Province that the Criminal Law Amendment Act should not have been invoked in the manner it has been done in the last few months. Many like me, feel very strongly that it was absolutely unnecessary to have introduced Hindi compulsorily. Myself and members of my party have made our views very plain on this question when the demand for grant in this connection came up in the House during the last Budget session. I do not want to repeat the arguments advanced by hon. Members on this side of the House on this point on that occasion. It should be clearly understood, however much the Government might be anxious to introduce Hindi compulsorily, that it has provoked serious opposition in the country. Though some hon. Members may think that the opposition to Hindi is directed by political opponents, I for one am not prepared to accept that statement *in toto*, for I believe strongly that this opposition is being carried on to-day not only by political opponents of the Congress Party but by many persons who had never been in politics all their life. I only wish to impress upon the Government

[Kumararaja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad]

the natural apprehensions created in the minds of many persons interested in the welfare of Tamil culture and literature. I do want the Government to appreciate the sincerity of quite a number of persons in the Tamil country in opposing Hindi and to understand that these persons have been actuated by very good motives for the future of Tamil literature and culture.

" The agitation that has been carried on for the last few months is mainly with the object of impressing upon the Government that it is unnecessary to introduce Hindi compulsorily. The opposition would have died down if the Government had conceded their point. I know that they have conceded to a small extent, viz., that boys are not compelled to pass an examination in Hindi. Even that has not allayed the apprehensions, for they feel that though it is not compulsory to get a number of marks in Hindi and pass an examination in it now. . ."

THE HON. MR. T. PRAKASAM :—" That has been there from the very beginning."

KUMARARAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—" I stand corrected. I am much obliged to the Hon. Minister for giving me the information. I am happy to think that the Government have to that extent agreed with us. Still why should there be this apprehension on the part of the people? They think that after some time the passing of an examination will be made a qualification for appointments and other things. We should be glad to know from the Government about this. But how can the Government give a guarantee for what will happen in the distant future? Even if they give a guarantee now who can say who will be in power after five years or seven years? Even assuming that the Congress party is in power it will not be possible for the present members of the Congress Cabinet to envisage what the members of a future Congress Cabinet would do? If many lovers of Tamil in this country have come forward with this agitation it is due to their real apprehensions in this matter.

" Sir, we are now primarily concerned in this resolution with the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. On the question of the necessity for a compulsory study of Hindi many hon. Members have spoken eloquently. My hon. Friend, the new addition to this House from North Arcot, the Muslim Member, has very intelligently put forward arguments to show that there is no necessity for compulsion and that if there is to be a language for all India it should evolve of its own accord and not by compulsion. I heartily agree with most of his arguments to the effect that there is no necessity for compulsion. If I remember rightly, Sir,—I would stand corrected if I am wrong—the Government have stated that the people are with them in regard to the

18th August 1938]

[Kumararaja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad]

compulsory introduction of Hindi. If people are with them why then do they resort to this compulsion? They could easily rely on the strength of their great organisation in the country. If they feel that the majority of the people are with them there should be absolutely no difficulty in introducing Hindi on an optional basis and at the same time seeing to it that most of the boys learnt Hindi. Suggestions have been made that indirect help and encouragement may be given to boys who take up Hindi by way of prizes, fee concessions and other things. The Government will realize the volume of objection if they meet some parents who have real apprehensions in the matter. There has been much genuine agitation in this respect however much the Government might think that there are only a few persons who carry on this agitation. However, if the persons are so few as the Government think them to be, there is no necessity for Government to worry.

"With regard to the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, I do not want to detail the history of that Act as my hon. Friend Diwan Bahadur Appadurai Pillai has already given a learned discourse on the history of the movement for the repeal of the Act and of how Congressmen have been ardently urging the repeal of the enactment. I do not want to repeat those arguments. Sir, it has been a surprise to many people in this province to find that the Congress Government are still trying to use this Act which they never intended to use. The bitterest critics of the measure have all been Congressmen, and one of their election pledges was that these repressive laws would cease to function as soon as Congressmen came into power. Perhaps they may say now, that circumstances have changed. But I do say that circumstances have not changed so as to warrant the use of such measures however provocative the Government may consider the methods of the anti-Hindi agitators. What will the public think, Sir, particularly after the advent of Provincial Autonomy? What will they feel, Sir, when they find that the Government is run with the aid of repressive laws? I would like the Prime Minister to realize the full implications of a popular Government being run with the aid of repressive laws. Apart from casting to the winds your election pledges, are you right in taking shelter behind an Act, the main object of which is the suppression of civil liberty? I may remind the House that the Executive Committee of the Civil Liberties Union recently passed a resolution to the effect that while they disapprove of the methods of the anti-Hindi agitators they were constrained to disapprove the action of the Government also in applying the Criminal Law Amendment Act. The whole position reduces itself to this: The present laws are quite enough to deal with the situation without resorting to the Criminal Law Amendment Act. There are many friendly critics of the Congress who think that the provisions of the ordinary law are quite enough. I am not a lawyer myself and I cannot offhand mention the laws.

[18th August 1938

[Kumararaja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad]

But if I am given time I will give the codes and the sections. For the moment I do not think I need take the time of the House any further than saying that the ordinary laws of the country are quite enough to deal with the situation. It has been admitted that the Criminal Law Amendment Act was promulgated and used in times of emergency by the then Government. I ask, Sir, whether that emergency has arisen to-day? I do not think the Government will go to the extent of saying that such an emergency has come as to make the laws of the country quite inadequate. It is the firm conviction of friends like me that the present laws are quite enough to deal with the situation, even if the Government want to put down this agitation.

" Sir, the Government or the Members of the Government in their various speeches have said that it is necessary to implement the resolutions of this Legislature particularly in the matter of Hindi. If the Government should realize their allegiance to the Legislature, I ask them, should they not realize also that the ultimate body to which they owe their allegiance is the electorate to whom they have already given a pledge to the effect that the repressive laws will be repealed. Sir, my main argument is that the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act is absolutely not necessary and is not warranted by the situation, and we expect the head of the Government to recognise that for a popular Government it is absolutely unnecessary to continue the application of the said Act and that repressive laws must cease to apply."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" When will I have my turn to reply, Sir? "

Mr. SPEAKER:—" After the Prime Minister's speech."

9-15 p.m. * The Hon. Mr. C. RAJAGOPALACHARIAR:—" Sir, it is a matter of great regret that we have been the cause of so much inconvenience to hon. Members who have had to stay so long for this. I should have requested you, Sir, under ordinary circumstances, to have taken private members' resolutions to have lapsed last night. But I should have been the cause of justifiable misunderstanding if we did not give ample, and more than ample time for this, what may practically be called an attempt to censure the Government. There is no difference between a vote of censure and the resolution now proposed. It is in that spirit and in that view that we thought it our duty to give the whole of to-day for private members' resolutions. It is a pity that some part of it was taken up by certain other matters, and that members would have to wait probably till ten o'clock to-night. At the same time, let me thank you, Sir, for giving us this opportunity of defending ourselves. The question has been debated on from all points of view; some of the points were very interesting, but at this late hour being irrelevant to the main issue, they would have to be put aside by me. The whole question of whether the particular dilect we seek to introduce in the schools is one that ought to be

18th August 1938] [Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar]

encouraged by the Mussalmans in their own interests or whether it is one that the Mussalmans according to their traditions accept as what they should love, as distinguished from a variant dialect, or whether it is the dialect spoken in Lucknow and Delhi alone or perhaps in Agra also, or whether it is a purer form of the language that Mussalmans in South India are speaking as their mother-tongue, and whether it is not really the standardized mother-tongue of some of the gentlemen who have spoken on this resolution here—all these are very interesting, and important also; but I submit for the vote of censure that is on the table to-day, they are irrelevant. Therefore it is that I do not go into all that, though I should have loved to discuss those questions rather than a question of this kind.

" What is the charge against the Government? There again, there are two currents of thought running, not perhaps plainly expressed, but still plainly running. There are some who feel ' Oh, satyagraha, picketing, Criminal Law Amendment Act, repression! You are paid in your own coin. Great satisfaction to us! '. Embarassing us by itself gives great satisfaction to some people, because these Congressmen have been paid in their own coin. But that current of thought I need not deal with to-day. The other current of thought is: ' We thought that these people were opposed to repression by nature, by up-bringing and by their own suffering; they have condemned repressive laws; now we have discovered a situation and a method by which they have no alternative but to use these repressive laws; they cannot use these repressive laws, or they won't use these repressive laws, and so we can successfully embarass them '. And they tried. But lo! and behold! ' This inconsistent Prime Minister says he will use this Act, this repression; he has broken his implicit promise; we will charge him with dishonesty and inconsistency.' They are very bitter. They feel extraordinarily disappointed that when they had depended on the creed of the Congress, on the statements of the Congress that they will not hinder the course of opposition and defiance in this way, in parrot-like copy of the Congress methods—they are grievously disappointed with our resorting to the methods and to the very law under which we ourselves had suffered. This disappointment, I say, they deserve. I have no apology to make on that basis. Much reference was made to the creed of the Congress, to the creed of the non-co-operators and to the statements made by all and sundry. The Criminal Law Amendment Act was also dealt with. Let me summarize the position for the hon. Member who seconded the proposition—Mr. A. Appadurai Pillai—Innocent Soul!—I must deal with him first. He says this is a good movement. He says ' If only you drop compulsion, the whole thing will go.' Let me tell him, Sir, the whole thing will not go if I drop this, and if I drop anything else also. Because, the object is clear. The object is *not* to prevent Hindustani from being learnt by

[Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar] [18th August 1938

boys and girls; the object is to obstruct this Government, to defy this Government, if obstruction won't do; to do anything to stop this Government which anything else will not do. Gentlemen opposite refer to our creed. I do not think that I need go beyond the author of this creed, Mahatma Gandhi. I am not fond of quoting him; I have not consciously quoted him up till now in this House; but since those who wish to move this censure against the Government quote him, I want that he should be quoted properly. That is why I quote him. Sir, those who have started with the stream, or rather the fish which have started so to say at the source, at Hardwar, know the Ganges as it runs along. They need not make tests to find the quality of the water. When we have started with that stream of satyagraha and with these doctrines, I do not think I shall be presumptuous if I say that we instinctively understand it like fish understanding their own water. But, as I said yesterday in the same connexion, a compounder is different from a doctor. The compounder goes by labels, but the doctor goes by ultimate knowledge. I shall not presume to be the doctor; that is why I quote Mahatma Gandhi himself. Now, in the year 1925, when the boycott of law courts was in full swing, the law courts were under lock and key against all Congressmen; they were not allowed to go to courts and plead or take cases without losing their caste in the Congress, not like now; again, they were at that time in the same manner as now people do, beginning to what they call 'picket'—I do not call it picketing, I would call it by its true name, as my colleague called it a few minutes ago in his speech concerning picketing. In the same manner as these gentlemen in their activities thought that the Congress Ministry was not going to use any repressive measures as they call them, they thought 'well, we will be prosecuted for nuisance perhaps; we will be taken to honorary magistrates who will perhaps inflict a fine of Rs. 5. That is all, there is money available; Rs. 3,000 at the rate of Rs. 5 each for 600 boys does not matter.' 'Or well, even if it be a month's imprisonment,—that is very unlikely, but even if it is so much as that—we will certainly come back. It is a fairly good joke.' They thought like that and they were disappointed. The great, long and terrible punishment of six months' imprisonment is given. Sir, to those who have talked the language of Satyagraha, six months used to be a shame. Nothing less than two years would satisfy our hearts then. The six months' man would hang down his head as soon as the sentence was pronounced for the shame of having received a light sentence. Well, six months is referred to as very terrible. I do not want to go into that; but a disappointment such as I referred to, was shared by another set of people in 1925 in another case I am referring to. In those days, people borrowed money from our khadi boards, from our Congress Committees, and they would not pay; they wanted to deceive and said: 'You cannot go to law courts, you have promised us that you would not go to courts.' Just like

18th August 1938] [Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar]

some friends to-day, then too there were friends who thought that we could not go to law courts as we were boycotting them, that it would be a damn shame if we did and we would be losing our caste. Therefore we would let money go and we won't prosecute or do anything. Here is what Mahatmaji stated at that time:—

'An Andhra friend writes '—that is how he begins—' Many people are taking undue advantage and not paying the amounts due to Congress Committees and Khadder Boards, knowing it for certain—that they would not proceed against them in British Courts. This of course amounts to misappropriation and cheating, if not worse. In view of what you have written already regarding misappropriation of funds and now the removal of ban on courts, I am quite sure that the Congress Committees can proceed in courts under these circumstances.'

"That is the quotation from the letter, and Mahatmaji has replied thus:—

'I have already given my opinion in such a case. I have no doubt that even when the boycott of courts was on foot, it was the duty of Congress Committees to proceed against fraudulent and defaulting debtors. The boycott was not meant for the Congress to commit suicide. It presupposed honesty on the part of those who dealt with the Congress.'

"Sir, the principle is the same. If we had been robbed or cheated of our money, there was no boycott of courts or this or that. That is the compounder's label. But I want to tell you that this principle is not in one article of 'Young India'; I can quote a few more, but I do not want to take time, because it is a definite, well-established principle from the very beginning. If I have a rope and use it to draw water or give it to a child to draw water, the rope is to be used for drawing water only, not to entangle the child's legs and to put the child into the well to die there. These creeds, doctrines and principles are intended for honest application, for those who believed in them,—not as false defences, not as subterfuges for those who would escape and not for those who knew nothing of those dotcrines and who want to take advantage of them for their own benefit or gain. Sir, suppose Japan to-day started telling China—not the Japanese soldiers but the camp followers—' You are Buddhists, you are against killing; you have sworn to that effect, how can you attack the Japanese soldiers; why are you using these weapons which Buddha did not allow '—would it not be ridiculous? It will be equally ridiculous for people who have done anything which Mr. Prakasam has just described, or people who have instigated them to do those things or people who have paid them to do those things, or for people who have tolerated them to do those things—I come to the last class, because it is not for them even to tolerate them, apart from actually giving encouragement to them—Is it for them to say that we should not use an Act which we wanted to be repealed in the year 1935 and which we then objected to? It is ridiculous.

"Sir, I do not claim to be a perfectly patient man. I do not claim to be a perfectly non-violent man, but I claim I have been

patient, I have been non-violent. 'Repression' is the word used. I had intended, Sir, to describe what was done. I was intending to describe the offence first before describing what was done with the offenders; but I am very glad that I am saved that by my colleague.

" What is it that is done by the offenders? I do not mind—one of my hon. Friends who spoke referred to it—the *noise*. I have one ear which is working and another ear which is deaf. I can sleep in a railway train, in a market, if necessary, with the wrong ear up and the right ear down. (Laughter.) I do not mind the noise at all. But there is a noise which I mind very much—a noise which tells people to 'hate one another,' a noise which rouses hatred of the worst type, a noise which gives voice to ideas which are dangerous for the country—hatred between class and class. Do hon. Members know how this Government is described by those boys, who are made to describe without understanding it? They describe by caste, describe by their sacred thread, describe by the tuft of hair on their head. (Hon. Members: 'Shame!') Is that noise there? It would cut hon. Members to the quick if similar language were used which could be understood or felt by hon .Members who spoke here before on behalf of the resolution, even if it were whispered in the slightest tone in the ear. Well, it is not because I was annoyed that I am displeased with it, but because it is positively dangerous to the country; it would be suicidal to the progress of the country if such things were allowed. These communal hatreds, if they were developed for real communal hatred, I would tolerate them gladly, because the hatred is there and it is good to know it; but if the hatred is developed in boys who have no such hatred and developed for petty purposes of their own, I am angry. This communal hatred is nothing. We are bound to deal with this communal hatred and we can deal with it, Sir. The previous Government that was in possession—I am not referring to the temporary Ministry—the permanent Government that was before in power—they might have been indifferent to the permanent evil of communal hatred. They only cared for peace and order; communal hatred disturbed order and so they did not want it. But, surely we have a greater interest in preventing these communal hatreds and the development of communal hatreds. They could have been satisfied with just enough arrangement of law, police and order and machinery to meet communal hatred to the point of and not allowing its development into a communal disturbance. We cannot be satisfied with the minimum, because it will kill like itself, if we allow these things. That is the reason why, Sir, we want to stop it. It is not enough to give Rs. 2 fine or As. 4 fine for such things. It is an annoyance to the national heart and not merely annoyance to a gentleman who wants to sleep or carry on his work. What is being done with them?

18th August 1938] [Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar]

" ' Repression '—we used the word, Congressmen used the word ' repression,' but they never used the word ' repression ' for the trial of a man for any offence or any trial with all the paraphernalia of lawyers, appeals, witnesses and adjournments of courts, with rights of appeal, with rights of stay application, with right of arguments to be carried on interminably and ending in three months, four months, five months, six months, or one year's imprisonment. Did we ever call it repression? Never. When people were not prosecuted or tried or arrested, but were beaten, bones were broken and physical injuries mercilessly dealt, we used the word repression; but even then, not we, but others used the word ' repression.' Sir, those who are now in Government here never complained about trials, perhaps, never complained even about repression, never complained certainly about trials. This resolution which is placed before this House to-day refers to repression. Not even the vilest abuse that I have read with these eyes, printed in literature, multiplied by the tens of thousands and circulated among ignorant masses, not even the vilest abuse and falsest statements made therein, had been made the subject-matter of prosecution. Have I taken two lakhs of rupees from the Shermadevi Gurukula? Yet, I have read it with my own eyes in this connexion,—printed and published. Have I asked for a prosecution? No. Has a single procession been stopped? Has a single demonstration been ordered not to be conducted under section 144? Some men told me, ' Why not you simplify matters? This Criminal Law Amendment Act is objected to. Get an order passed under section 144 and it will take its own course. Men are used to it. Nobody will call it repression.' I said ' No.' I cannot ask a false statement to be made that there was going to be a breach of the peace in front of my house, because of this; there would be no such breach of the peace. I won't allow such a statement to be made. I cannot ask for an order under section 144 or 107. I cannot say under section 504, that I was going to commit a breach of the peace or that any others were going to commit a breach of the peace, whatever may be the provocation. It would be wrong to say, therefore, that there is ground for applying those sections.

" ' Compounders ' tell me " why don't you apply section 107? ' Section 107 cannot be applied unless I make a false statement that they are going to commit a breach of the peace. They are only going to insult. They would commit a breach of the peace only if I went out of the picture. It would not be right to make that statement and apply either section 107 or 144. The only other section that any legal compounder can tell me is 290, i.e., to take him to an honorary magistrate and ask the latter to fine for a casual nuisance. Why, you have seen with your own eyes how a casual nuisance offender is treated with a light heart. A man

with a naked knife goes up to the platform in an enormous crowd. He is sent home with a fine. No quarrel with that. But is this a casual offence? It is deliberately organized by people who remain behind. Boys who do not know to read or write a word of Tamil, come and say 'Let Hindi perish for ever' 'Let Aryan rule perish' and those boys do not even know how to pronounce properly the Tamil words they utter. They are made to suffer. Those who instigate them are prosecuted for abetment and that is called repression. I say an abetter is the principal offender in that case, not the boy who comes and shouts. The man who comes on a bicycle and fixes the boys is the principal offender, not the boys who stand there. Therefore, Sir, there is no repression about it. I say to the House with a clean conscience, there is no picketing about it. I say with a clean conscience, it is not picketing. What is picketing? If a man goes to drink and I want to ask him not to drink, if a man goes to work in a shop where we agree under the trade union not to work, I ask him not to go, that is picketing; but if I do more, it is not picketing. But here what is it that he is asked to do, the man there? What is it that he asks me not to do or any body else not to do? Nothing. The only thing, he does is to irritate, to provoke, to annoy and to insult. He does not ask anybody not to do anything or to do anything. That is not picketing in any definition. There is no picketing, there is no Satyagraha about it. That is the offence and this is the repression. Sir, therefore, it is idle to attempt to make out here that this is a case of breach of promise or breach of Congress doctrines. If, supposing Sir, there has been a failure on our part to be true to our principles, how is it a basis for this resolution? This Government can be removed by those who are responsible for those doctrines. It is not for the man who borrowed from the Khaddar Board to say that the courts should be boycotted; it is for Gandhiji to say that courts should be boycotted, not for the man who borrowed from the Khaddar Board and is trying to cheat the Khaddar Board. This resolution, therefore, Sir, has no legs to stand upon. It has no morality behind it. It has no principle of good government behind it.

"Mr. Appadurai Pillai gave us a constructive remedy worthy of consideration. 'Remove this compulsion. Let these Satyagrahis go. Let these anti-Hindi agitators go.' Agitation it is called. There is no agitation about it. All agitation is permitted. There is no repression against agitation whatsoever. These people ask persons to commit these ill-advised and deliberate vulgar offences before those who wish to do their public duty. 'What you have to do is to give preferential treatment to those who have learnt Hindi optionally.' Bless the innocent soul of Mr. Appadurai Pillai! Without knowing it he has advised me to commit the gravest of crimes that could possibly have been committed by

18th August 1938] [Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar]

me in the eyes of those who are conducting this activity. Mr. Appadurai Pillai does not know what is being said, what is being argued by these people—leaders of those people. Sir A. T. Pannir Selvam gave away the show, or was it the Leader of the Opposition who gave away the show, as he has every right to do? He said, 'even if you do not give preferential treatment, what guarantee is there that your successor who will come later on will not give preferential treatment. Therefore, do not have Hindi at all.' He failed to see that he was contradicting his good friend, Mr. Appadurai Pillai's suggestion. Mr. Appadurai Pillai is entitled to lead me into danger and give me away to the wolves afterwards. If I accepted Mr. Appadurai Pillai's advice and said 'let Hindi be optional. We will appoint people who know Hindi,' surely I would have walked into the mouth of the wolves and the Leader of the Opposition and his friends would have devoured me altogether. We won't teach a few boys and give them preference.

"Sir, it is because I have no communal feeling in my heart, and because I can instinctively understand what is good for people of all communities that I said 'No, this shall not be optional.' Because, these few will take advantage of it and we will be opening ourselves before those who come behind to the charge that we began a thing which gave preference for certain boys and it did not give equal justice to all boys. And after all, how can children understand their own needs? You can best understand what is good for them. It is the duty of the Government to say what is bad and what is good to learn for them. Therefore, even at the risk of abuse, even at the risk of misunderstanding, even at the risk of being hauled up before Congress courts by persons who might have little to do with the Congress, I say that this must be done and we should give equal opportunities for people who will have their chance in future India. But what is the idea behind Mr. Appadurai Pillai's recommendation? Would it be right to allow boys to grow up without a knowledge of the essential thing which we know is good for them? Never mind other reasons. What is the duty of the Government with regard to Education? Much false emphasis has been laid on compulsion. Let me tell hon. Members, in the Government Order about which all this fuss is made, there is no use of the word 'compulsion' at all. The order simply says, 'this becomes an essential part of the daily curriculum of the schools.' It is no longer an after-class teaching; it is not teaching which a boy can run away from; it is just as essential as arithmetic; it is just as essential as his multiplication table, which he cannot run away from and which is prescribed as good and essential for him. There is no more compulsion in it. Not as a result of this opposition—it does not matter even if it is—if at any time it is found to be not good—agitation or no agitation—it will be given up. But I know it is good; I know the whole thing. I had

[Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar] [18th August 1938

opposed compulsory introduction of Hindustani for the elementary schools myself, for I knew it was not good for tender children. I have opposed compulsory khadi for peons; and I have opposed compulsion for many other things. But here, I said, boys *must* be taught; the compulsion is on the teacher. If the boy does not read and if he fails, still he will be promoted; there is no compulsion. That is the compulsion to which I am a party. There is much more compulsion for other subjects, but not for this. This is a concession, given even before the agitation—and even if it were on account of the agitation, I have no hesitation in giving credit to it. To give it up, not because it was not right, but simply to put out of the way some difficulty I am faced with—it would certainly be a wrong thing to do.

"What is it that I would be doing in giving it up? If I yield to it I am doing a wrong thing with regard to the education of our boys. If I yield to it I am going against all our plain commonsense with regard to the future of India; I am also killing self-government to that extent. Gentlemen opposite quoted parliamentary conventions, Sir, about your going to England or Europe for the study of the working of parliamentary institutions there. I said on the other day that the mere passing of the budget provision is not compulsion to incur the expenditure. You, Sir, explained yourself and said it was only permission, and therefore it does not bind you to do it. What is the budget provision about Hindustani? (Interruption.) There was a discussion over it; it was allowed. What is the consequence? Those who now raise objection, should not object, having allowed it before. This House, having permitted the estimates in respect of Hindustani, has no right to take it up again—members have no right to raise it again—because once it is accepted, in principle, it is finished. Therefore the only thing that can be taken up now is "repression" and not Hindustani. But there is a further and more substantial difference. As I said about the Speaker's voyage, there are certain subjects where a grant means an expectation that the Government will carry it out; and there are other matters where it is left to the person to do or not to do a thing. Suppose a provision is made in the budget sanctioning the purchase of a motor car for the Premier. It is permitted to me to spend the amount or not. I may or may not buy. Suppose a provision is made in the budget for the opening of an Agricultural College. It would be absurd to say it is permissible. Therefore I say it is not a right analogy. But it was said, 'you can give it up.' What will be the meaning of it?

"To oppose foreign rule is one thing. But has a minority in parliamentary government the right continually to defy the decision of the majority? It was stated that we were offering passive resistance, and so, it should be good enough even now. It would be the denial of the whole parliamentary system of government if that

18th August 1938] [Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar]

were allowed. A nation which is subject to foreign domination—I say it here in the clearest terms on the floor of the House—is always at war with the dominating nation, and there is no question of parliamentary rules to be applied to the conflict between the people and the Government in that case. But if, under a system of parliamentary government we wish to carry on our own affairs, we must accept the limitations of parliamentary practice. A minority, however small, has a right to oppose, has a right to discuss, has a right to demonstrate, has a right to question, has a right to go on writing in the press and try to change the people's mind. Let there be no mistake about it. The other day a leading newspaper misunderstood me and commented. I do not deny the right of continual agitation, whatever the decision may be. But what I do deny in parliamentary government is the right of the minority to *defy* the Government of the majority and make Government impossible. Once a decision is arrived at, parliamentary system of government demands that the minority as well as the majority should combine, and there should be no defiance. There need be no end to parliamentary agitations, such as in elections, bye-elections or appeals to the electorate, or in the press or on platform without let or hindrance in any way. But certainly parliamentary government is impossible if the minority, can defy majority government for all time without break. This is against all conventions of parliamentary government. But I am not quoting Westminster now. I say that self-government in India would be impossible if we adopt it. Sir, suppose we retire now from Government; and to-morrow another Government comes into power. Are we to go and picket the houses of Members of Government, and then contra, and then contra, and so on. The whole thing would be an open invitation to the powers of the world to come to India if we carried on like that. Sir, I shall not detain the House any longer. If the Leader of the Opposition had spoken before Hon. Mr. Prakasam, I would not have spoken at all. I would have said, Mr. Prakasam's speech is mine, and the Government reply is there, and the debate would have closed. But it would not have been courtesy if I did not rise and offer a word of explanation of Government's position after the Leader of the Opposition spoke.

"I submit, Sir, that the House should, without hesitation, throw out this resolution."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Sir, I am sorry some of the speakers have misunderstood the significance of the resolution and dealt with the question of language at length. I object to resorting to oppression against our own people. I have grown twenty years older in the hope and aspiration for achieving freedom for my motherland and 260 millions of my fellow countrymen. Freedom to me means civil liberty. But when a responsible Government employs repressive legislation against our own people who are

opposing a Government measure in connexion with a language in exercise of their civil right my disappointment and sorrow are profound. The Government have shown to us that they can get through any legislation in the briefest possible time. They could have repealed the Criminal Law Amendment Act and had the criminal legislation that the Hon. the Premier has been speaking of passed in the Legislature instead of using the condemned lawless law. Poison is always poison. My conception of freedom has been shaken by the conduct of people's Government. My opposition is therefore to ' repression ' and not to the language that is to be imposed on the people."

The resolution was put to vote and lost without a division.

The House adjourned to meet again at 3 p.m. the next day.